

2-23-1994

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/23/1994

Sue Tirotta

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 02/23/1994" (1994). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 596.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/596>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

Presiding Officer: Sidney Nesselroad
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirotta

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except: Beath, Caples, Carbaugh, Medlar, Nott, Olivero, Rubin, Sahlstrand, Schactler, Taylor and Thelen.
Visitors: Anne Denman, John Ressler, Don Cummings, Jeff Olsen, Carolyn Wells and Kris Henry.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

***MOTION NO. 2938** Mark Zetterberg moved and Rob Perkins seconded a motion to approve the February 23, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting minutes as distributed. Passed.

COMMUNICATIONS

- 1/27/94 memo from Don Cummings, Chair - General Education Committee, regarding Faculty Senate MOTION NO. 2933; see Curriculum Committee report below.
- 1/28/94 memo from Economics Department faculty regarding Salary Adjustment Proposal; referred to Personnel Committee.
- 1/31/93 memo from Charles McGehee, Chair - Academic Affairs Committee, re. standards and criteria for awarding honors; see Academic Affairs Committee report below.
- 2/1/94 letter from Provost Thomas Moore withdrawing prior request for membership on Faculty Senate; referred to Code Committee.
- 2/3/94 memo from Lin Douglas, Associate Dean of SPS, regarding speaking and writing across the curriculum; referred to Executive Committee.
- 2/7/94 memo from Libby Street, Chair - Personnel Committee, regarding Faculty Activity Analysis; referred to Executive Committee (see Chair's report below).
- 2/7/94 memo from Libby Street, Chair - Personnel Committee, regarding University Minority Participation and Diversity Action Plan; referred to Executive Committee.
- 2/14/94 memo from John Brangwin, ASCWU/BOD, regarding students on governing boards; see Public Affairs Committee report below.

REPORTS

1. CHAIR

-Chair Nesselroad reported that, as a result of a recent Bylaws change allowing greater flexibility of membership on Senate standing committees, fewer Faculty Senators are volunteering for service on these committees. Although relaxation of the membership restrictions has made it easier to recruit and select interested faculty members for service, an element of 'ownership' by the Senate of its committees' activities, report and recommendations has been lost. The Chair will send a memo and questionnaire next week to all 1994-95 Senators requesting information related to standing committee service.

* * * * *

PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS SUSPENSION AND AMENDMENT

The following amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws were presented at the February 2, 1994 Faculty Senate meeting. Amendments of the Senate's Bylaws require a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

CONTINUITY OF FACULTY SENATE LEADERSHIP

***MOTION #2939:** Suspend the following portion of Faculty Senate Bylaws section X to allow the amendments in motion #2940 (below), if approved, to go into effect with the election of the 1994-95 Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

X. ...Amendments will go into effect immediately upon approval.

Rationale: The Faculty Senate will vote for its 1994-95 officers at the last meeting of Winter quarter: March 9, 1994. The change to the Bylaws presented below should be based on principle alone and should not be associated with a particular slate of candidates nominated for election to the Senate Executive Committee. If the amendment on the chairship (below) is approved, the vice chair elected on March 9, 1994 would serve as vice chair from June 15, 1994 to June 14, 1995 and automatically succeed to the chairship on June 15, 1995.

MOTION NO. 2939 passed.

1. CHAIR, continued*MOTION #2940:

Amend the Senate's Bylaws as follows:

III. Officers of the SenateB. Powers and Duties1. Chair

The Faculty Senate shall elect annually, from among its membership, a vice chair, secretary, and two at large officers chair and such other principal officers, with their powers and duties, as established in its Bylaws. The vice chair of the Senate will automatically succeed to the chairship on an annual basis. The immediate past Senate chair (or most recent past Senate Chair available, as outlined in section IV.A.1. of these Bylaws) will serve on the Executive Committee. The chair shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Senate, at any Faculty Forum, and at general faculty meetings upon request by the President of the university. The Chair shall serve as official representative and spokesman of the faculty and Senate in communication with the faculty, and in this capacity shall have ex officio membership upon all major administrative committees. As chief executive officer of the Senate, the Chair shall coordinate and expedite the business of the Senate and its committees (Faculty Code Section 3.20). The chair of the Faculty Senate shall receive 50% released time from regular duties during the term of office (Faculty Code section 7.25);[BYLAWS CHANGE EFFECTIVE WITH ELECTION OF 1994-95 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE]

Rationale:

The Faculty Senate has indicated support for strengthening the continuity of its leadership. A change should minimize the impact on departments of releasing a faculty member half-time while maximizing utilization of limited resources. The proposed amendment to the Bylaws ensures a three year commitment to the Senate Executive Committee -- as vice chair, chair and past chair. This should optimize information exchange as well as provide time for departments to plan for the careful replacement of faculty who will be released to the Senate chairship in the year following their election as vice chair.

Senator Charles McGehee, Sociology, spoke against MOTION NO. 2940, stating that formalization of this process by instituting a Bylaws change would not enhance continuity of Senate leadership, would make it difficult for the standing Chair to serve a second term if so desired, make it difficult for departments to plan and budget in advance, and allow no recourse in electing another individual as Chair if the Vice Chair proved an undesirable candidate as Chair. Senator Dan Ramsdell, History, opposed the motion on the grounds that a yearly rotation of the Chairship is important to the democratic process, and it would be more difficult to recruit the best individuals for the Chair's position if they were required to serve on the Senate Executive Committee for three years (as Vice Chair, Chair, and Past Chair). Senator Ken Gamon, Math, stated that the Senates at the other state universities (as well as those within most professional organizations) have a structure that allows for an orderly progression from Vice Chair to Chair, this process seems to work well for them, and other schools seem to take their Senate election process much more seriously than does Central. Senator Vince Nethery, PE, stated that it would seem to be an advantage, rather than a disadvantage, for departments to be able to plan in advance, and the Vice Chair should be able to take a more active in learning the duties of the Chair if they served a year as Chair-Elect. Chair Nesselroad pointed out that advance budget planning for the Chair's released time should no longer be a problem for departments since the Senate is now funded to directly compensate departments. In response to questions regarding other options to strengthen continuity of Senate leadership, Chair Nesselroad replied that this motion embodies a composite of the most workable options discussed by the Senate earlier this year.

MOTION NO. 2940 defeated (9 yes, 14 no).

* * * * *

***MOTION NO. 2941** Suspend the following portion of Faculty Bylaws Section III.A. (Officers of the Senate -- Procedures for Election), for 1994-95 election ONLY: "Principal officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Senate at the last regular meeting of the Winter Quarter of each academic year" and allow the 1994-95 Faculty Senate Executive Committee to be elected at the first meeting of Spring Quarter 1994, April 6, 1994.

Rationale: Several departments have not yet reported their Senate election results. Delaying the election of the 1994-95 Executive Committee will allow more time for orderly recruitment and nomination. It will also allow time for the Senate to decide on whether or not to compensate the Senate Chair for summer service, and if so, how. Election at the first meeting of Spring Quarter will still provide transition time for the Chair-elect, who will immediately begin attending Deans' Council and Executive Committee meetings.

1. CHAIR, continued

Senator Barry Donahue, Computer Science, suggested that, since the Senate often suspends its Bylaws to allow election of the Executive Committee during Spring quarter, the Executive Committee consider a permanent Bylaws amendment. **MOTION NO. 2941** passed.

* * * * *

-Chair Nesselroad reported that Deans' Council is reviewing budget policy and philosophy to prioritize expenditure categories rather than approving simple across-the-board allocations. Several categories have been defined and targeted in this process, including faculty/instructional development, program development, goods and services, library, efficiency, and university governance. The Deans' Council has also recently discussed the Cultural Pluralism Team, a process to evaluate deans, program prioritization, formalization of a policy on class size, definition of un-tenured faculty, and relocation of the South Seattle Extended Degree Center.

* * * * *

-Chair Nesselroad reported that the Senate Personnel Committee reviewed the Faculty Activity Analysis form and commented on the process in a February 7, 1994, letter:

"First, we [Personnel Committee] continue to be concerned about the manner in which data are being collected. The lack of scientific rigor being brought to bear on the data collection process is frustrating. Unless data are being collected solely as an exercise in paper work and will not be used for decision making or public relations, the current procedure yields data of no value. We do not mean to suggest that faculty members will purposely distort the data, only that virtually everything we know about data collection suggests that historical guessing about behavior results in very low reliability information.

"Second, we are concerned that there are no clear indications about how the data will be used. Clearly we are unlikely to have any input into the use of these data by the Higher Education Coordinating Board; however, the members of the committee feel that the faculty should have some input into and assurances about how the data will be used on this campus. Members of the committee have participated in various discussions with administrators across campus and find a great deal of inconsistency in the assertions about how the data will be used. That it is data of unproven reliability and is being collected in the manner it is only because the HEC Board has dictated the procedure, we would hope that it would be put to NO use on this campus; would not be a component of decision making. Would it be possible to have a clear statement from the Provost or the President about current intent?

"Third and perhaps most importantly, we are concerned that "number of minutes of activity" of faculty is being equated with productivity. It is somewhat like grading public school children on the basis of their effort rather than their achievement. We recognize the difficulty in finding commonly accepted standards for outcomes of a university; we also recognize that some measure of efficiency of achieving outcomes is important. We are simply concerned that an incredibly simplistic perspective is being taken in assessing faculty commitment and effectiveness and request that the university administration and board actively discourage this perspective both in their discussions with governing bodies and in their personal discussions about faculty excellence. Further, we request additional dialog between faculty and administrators to establish other outcome data that might provide a clearer picture of our effectiveness."

Senators stated that they have received inconsistent replies from deans, the Provost and the President in response to questions about how data collected in the Faculty Activity Analysis may be used in internal decision making. Chair Nesselroad asked President Nelson to respond to this concern, and the President stated that since only data on hours per week of different types of work is being collected, no interpretations regarding productivity, outcomes or quality of work can be extrapolated.

2. PRESIDENT

President Ivory Nelson reported that university budget planning, including a ten year capital plan, is well under way, and he stated that faculty involvement at the department level is vital to the integrated process. The President distributed updated information regarding the progress of proposed legislation as well as outlines of the higher education portions of the Governor's, Senate's and House proposed biennial budgets. He briefly compared highlights of the three budget proposals and explained that the House budget is somewhat more favorable to higher education than the other versions, although each would require some cuts over the 1993-95 biennium. The President reported that although there seems to be support for incentives to faculty early retirement, this year's short legislative session did not allow development and promotion of this legislation, and the issue is expected to receive more study by next year.

3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Committee chair Charles McGehee, Sociology, delivered the following report:

STANDARD AND CRITERIA FOR AWARDING HONORS

In a letter dated June 9, 1993, President Nelson noted that 90 percent of the Presidential Scholars honored at the 1991-92 graduation were not only from one school of the university, but from one program, Early Childhood Education. Reviewing the list of Presidential Scholars for the year 1992-93, he found that some 95% of the recipients also came from one school of the university and from the same program, again Early Childhood Education.

President Nelson raised a series of questions to the Senate and others concerning grading practices and standards which may account for this phenomenon and suggested redefining the selection criteria for Presidential Scholars.

Accordingly, the Academic Affairs committee was charged October 15, 1993, to review the standards and criteria for awarding honors and to make recommendations. The Committee has examined the data and evaluated current policy. Following is our report and recommendations:

1. It is the Committee's conclusion that it is beyond the scope and resources of the Committee to undertake evaluation of the grading practices in any particular department. Singling out a department without regard to the problems and issues confronting that department relative to other departments would be tantamount to a witch-hunt. If B&E, for instance, has the highest GPA, which it does, it is inappropriate to evaluate that program exclusively in terms of the perceptions and values of others not party to the issues the program faces.
2. We do believe it appropriate, however, to insure that students of other programs with different academic concerns be given access to honors without direct competition wherein one program might dominate.

Currently, the CWU policy determines honors by general GPA level without regard to school or major. Cum laude is awarded to students with GPA's between 3.4 and 3.59; magna cum laude to students with GPA's between 3.6 and 3.79; and summa cum laude to students 3.8 to 4.00. The designation "Dean's Scholar" is reserved for those with GPA's from 3.6 to 3.94. A "President's Scholar" is a student whose GPA is 3.95 or higher.

The present procedure produces a highly variable number according to the yearly GPA listing. In 1990-91, for instance, there were 19 Presidential Scholars (GPA 3.95 or higher), 3 in B&E, 3 in CLAS, and 13 in SPS. By comparison, there were 30 in 1991-92 with 5 in B&E, 6 in CLAS, and 21 in SPS. In 1992-93 there were 13, of which 2 were from B&E, 3 from CLAS, and 8 from SPS.

Separating the schools for the purpose of naming Presidential and Dean's Scholars would avoid, to some extent, competition among programmatically different GPA's. Furthermore, taking a specific percentage of the top GPA's would provide comparability among the schools.

For example, in the academic year 1992-93, there were 626 graduates in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences; 515 in the School of Business and Economics; and 622 in the School of Professional Studies. If one were to have taken, say, the top 1% for Presidential Honors, there would have been six from CLAS with a GPA cutoff of 3.943; five from B&E with a GPA cutoff of 3.916; and six from SPS with a GPA cutoff of 3.967.

The majors represented in CLAS would have been two from Psychology, one Law and Justice, one English, and two Philosophy; in B&E, four from Business Administration and one from Accounting; and in SPS, one from Electrical Engineering Technology, three from Early Childhood Education, one from Elementary Education and one from School Health Education.

The Academic Affairs Committee finds this approach satisfies the goal of providing broad access to high honors while respecting the differences between programs. We therefore recommend the following:

Recommendation No. 1: President's and Dean's Scholars be designated as follows:

President's Scholars -- top 1% of graduates in the current academic year (defined as summer, fall, winter and spring quarters) by school based on cumulative GPA as calculated by existing university policy. (17 for the academic year 1992-93)

Dean's Scholars -- top 5% of graduates in the current academic year but not including the top 1%, by school based on cumulative GPA. (71 for the academic year 1992-93)

Individual Studies Program majors will be considered under the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences.

This is similar to the current practices at the University of Washington and Western Washington University. Cut off for all honors are decided arbitrarily each year, and at Western they are fixed percentages based on the GPA's of the previous year. The Committee rejects the Western practice because (1) students are being judged relative to a different population and (2) it produces very erratic results. For instance, there would have been 25 President's Scholars in 1991-92 if the cutoff had been based on 1% of the previous year's graduates,

3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, continued

whereas 1992-93 would have had 8 President's Scholars if based on 1991-92. One percent of each year, however, would have produced 17 in each year.

The value of using the previous year as the criterion, of course, is in knowing in advance what the cutoff points will be. Under our proposal, the cutoff point would not be known absolutely until after graduation.

Under current CWU policy, honors are designated only preliminarily based on end of Winter quarter data. Students can, and do, advance or lose their position based on final Spring quarter performance, though it is unusual.

We, therefore, recommend the following:

Recommendation No. 2:

Retain the current procedure for establishing honors while substituting the new criteria. That is, the Registrar will calculate the top percentages for declared graduates based on end of Winter quarter data. After Spring quarter graduation when all individual and collective data are in, final determination of honors will be made.

3. As regards general honors, the Academic Affairs Committee proposes retaining the principle of general cutoff levels based on cumulative GPA. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, there is no public comparison between persons as to who receives honors or not and no one is excluded from an award because of the nature of competitive programs. For another, prepublication of the cutoff levels are used widely by students as goals as well as indicators of success. While one might argue that this contributes to a grade-oriented climate, it is nonetheless the case and students value it. Changing to a percentage based procedure would increase anxiety and irritation without providing any clear benefits.

On the other hand, at 3.4 CWU currently has the lowest standards for honors of any public institution in the Washington State and shares the position of lowest with one private institution. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends raising the minimum standard for general honors to the current minimum level for Eastern, Gonzaga, Seattle Pacific, Seattle U., and WSU.

Recommendation No. 3: The standards for general honors should be as follows:

- 3.5-3.69 cum laude
- 3.7-3.89 magna cum laude
- 3.9-4.00 summa cum laude

Recommendation No. 4: The preceding recommendations, if approved, should be implemented starting with the summer quarter of 1994 for the 1994-95 academic year.

***MOTION NO. 2942** Charles McGehee moved that President's and Dean's Scholars be designated as follows: President's Scholars -- top 1% of graduates in the current academic year (defined as summer, fall, winter and spring quarters) by school based on cumulative GPA as calculated by existing university policy. (17 for the academic year 1992-93)

Dean's Scholars -- top 5% of graduates in the current academic year but not including the top 1%, by school based on cumulative GPA. (71 for the academic year 1992-93)

Individual Studies Program majors will be considered under the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences.

MOTION NO. 2942 passed.

***MOTION NO. 2943** Charles McGehee moved that the university retain the current procedure for establishing honors while substituting the new criteria. That is, the Registrar will calculate the top percentages for declared graduates based on end of Winter quarter data. After Spring quarter graduation when all individual and collective data are in, final determination of honors will be made.

MOTION NO. 2943 passed.

***MOTION NO. 2944** Charles McGehee moved that the standards for general honors should be as follows:

- 3.5-3.69 cum laude
- 3.7-3.89 magna cum laude
- 3.9-4.00 summa cum laude

MOTION NO. 2944 passed.

***MOTION NO. 2945** Charles McGehee moved that the policy changes in Motions 2942, 2943 and 2944 be implemented starting with the summer quarter of 1994 for the 1994-95 academic year.

MOTION NO. 2945 passed.

* * * * *

3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, continued

Committee chair McGehee reported that the Academic Affairs Committee was charged earlier this year to review a September 27, 1993, request by Owen Pratz, Psychology, that would allow faculty to drop students on the first day of class for non-attendance. Senator McGehee distributed the Committee's November 23, 1993, report to the Senate and explained that the current policy permits faculty to drop students on the third day of instruction. The Committee reached the conclusion that it is unfair to penalize students for non-attendance on the first day of class and noted that the most significant problem, regardless of which day the student drops the class, is notification of the Registrar's office. Since documentation through campus mail is slow, the Committee strongly recommends that any documentation regarding a student dropping a class be faxed, e-mailed or delivered by hand to the Registrar the same day.

4. BUDGET COMMITTEE

No report

5. CODE COMMITTEE

Senator Barry Donahue, Computer Science, noted that in a memo dated February 1, 1994, Provost Thomas Moore withdrew his 7/23/93 request for membership on the Faculty Senate from consideration by the Code Committee. Chair Nesselroad stated that the Senate Executive Committee discussed the issue and will recommend that the Code Committee consider the principle of the request to include the university's chief academic officer as a member of the Senate.

6. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Curriculum Committee member Steve Olson reported that a motion to add Geology 170 to the General Education Program was tabled at the January 12, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting until members of the General Education Committee attended a Senate meeting to answer questions regarding the proposal. General Education Committee chair Don Cummings, English, and member John Ressler, Geography, were in attendance.

***MOTION NO. 2946** Steve Olson moved that **MOTION NO. 2933**, as follows, be removed from the table:
MOTION NO. 2933: Add Geology 170 [Volcanoes, Earthquakes, and Civilization] to the list of non-lab physical science options in the breadth block of the General Education Program.
MOTION NO. 2946 passed.

Senator John Brangwin, ASCWU/BOD, stated that the anticipated comprehensive review of the mission, objectives and definition of the university's General Education Program should be completed before adding more courses to the Program. John Ressler reported that a working definition of General Education is in place, and the General Education Committee must work within the current model until changes are made. Dr. Ressler stated that the addition of Geology 170 satisfies current General Education Program criteria, and the Committee did not consider unreasonable the absence of a lab associated with the course or the fact that it would be a 3 credit course within a 4 credit requirement area. Don Cummings added that the Geology 170 course was presented to the General Education Committee as part of a systematic overhaul of the entire Geology curriculum, and the Committee saw the addition of Geology 170 as a good opportunity to attract more students, especially those in elementary education, to the physical sciences. He stated that the anticipated overall impact on students and programs of this course addition would be minimal and added that the Committee has been working steadily on a study of the General Education Program and hopes to have a proposal ready by early Spring quarter.
MOTION NO. 2933 defeated.

* * * * *

Steve Olson reported that the Curriculum Committee recently reviewed the efficacy of recent changes in the curriculum flow process. The addition of global search capabilities to the electronic catalog will soon make it easier for departments and deans to determine potential curricular overlap. The Curriculum Committee will propose adding Program Evaluators/Academic Services to the flow process to check for clerical accuracy of proposed curriculum changes.

7. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

No report

8. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Committee chair Dan Ramsdell, History, reported that the Senate Executive Committee received a February 14, 1994, memo from Senator John Brangwin, ASCWU Representative for Academic Affairs, concerning Faculty Senate discussion begun at the February 2, 1994, Senate meeting of legislation concerning students on governing boards.

***MOTION NO. 2947** John Brangwin moved and Kristin Starbuck seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate express no position on the issue of Students on Governing Boards.

President Ivory Nelson recommended that the Senate express its views on all issues of university governance, including the composition of governing boards. Dan Ramsdell pointed out that the Public Affairs Committee has not taken a formal position on this issue but seeks direction from the Senate. Council of Faculty Representatives member Ken Gamon reported that CFR encourages faculty to express an opinion on this issue. Senators pointed out that C.W.U.'s governing board had student membership at one time, but it is not necessary for the Senate to take a position on all legislative issues.

MOTION NO. 2947 defeated (12 yes, 13 no).

***MOTION NO. 2948** Charles McGehee moved and Rob Perkins seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate support the presence of students on governing boards.

MOTION NO. 2948 passed (unanimous).

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

***** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: March 9, 1994 *****

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, February 23, 1994
SUB 204-205

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 2, 1994
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS**
 - 1/27/94 memo from Don Cummings, Chair - General Education Committee, re. Faculty Senate MOTION NO. 2933; see Curriculum Committee report below.
 - 1/28/94 memo from Economics Department faculty re. Salary Adjustment Proposal; referred to Personnel Committee.
 - 1/31/93 memo from Charles McGehee, Chair - Academic Affairs Committee, re. standards and criteria for awarding honors; see Academic Affairs Committee report below.
 - 2/1/94 letter from Provost Thomas Moore withdrawing prior request for membership on Faculty Senate; referred to Code Committee.
 - 2/3/94 memo from Lin Douglas, Associate Dean of SPS, re. speaking and writing across the curriculum; referred to Executive Committee.
 - 2/7/94 memo from Libby Street, Chair - Personnel Committee, re. Faculty Activity Analysis; referred to Executive Committee.
 - 2/7/94 memo from Libby Street, Chair - Personnel Committee, re. University Minority Participation and Diversity Action Plan; referred to Executive Committee.
 - 2/14/94 memo from John Brangwin, ASCWU/BOD, re. students on governing boards; see Public Affairs Committee report below.
- V. REPORTS**
 - 1. CHAIR**
 - MOTION: Proposed Faculty Senate Bylaws change (attached)
 - Deans' Council Update
 - 2. PRESIDENT**
 - 3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
 - Policy re. dropping students from classes
 - Standards and criteria for awarding honors
 - 4. BUDGET COMMITTEE**
 - 5. CODE COMMITTEE**
 - 6. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**
 - MOTION NO. 2933 -- tabled 1/12/94 re. proposal to add Geology 170 to General Education Program (attached)
 - 7. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**
 - 8. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
 - Students on Governing Boards (memo attached)
 - Development of incentives for Faculty Early Retirement
 - Development of a faculty-oriented public affairs service
- VI. OLD BUSINESS**
- VII. NEW BUSINESS**

***** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: March 9, 1994 *****

CHAIR

PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS SUSPENSION AND AMENDMENT

NOTE: The following amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws were presented at the February 2, 1994 Faculty Senate meeting. Amendments of the Senate's Bylaws require a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

CONTINUITY OF FACULTY SENATE LEADERSHIP

MOTION #1: Suspend the following portion of Faculty Senate Bylaws section X to allow the amendments in motion #2 (below), if approved, to go into effect with the election of the 1994-95 Faculty Senate Executive Committee:
X. ...Amendments will go into effect immediately upon approval.

Rationale: The Faculty Senate will vote for its 1994-95 officers at the last meeting of Winter quarter: March 9, 1994. The change to the Bylaws presented below should be based on principle alone and should not be associated with a particular slate of candidates nominated for election to the Senate Executive Committee. If the amendment on the chairship (below) is approved, the vice chair elected on March 9, 1994 would serve as vice chair from June 15, 1994 to June 14, 1995 and automatically succeed to the chairship on June 15, 1995.

MOTION #2: Amend the Senate's Bylaws as follows:

III. Officers of the Senate

B. Powers and Duties

1. Chair

The Faculty Senate shall elect annually, from among its membership, a vice chair, secretary, and two at large officers ~~chair and such other principal officers~~, with their powers and duties, as established in its Bylaws. The vice chair of the Senate will automatically succeed to the chairship on an annual basis. The immediate past Senate chair (or most recent past Senate Chair available, as outlined in section IV.A.1. of these Bylaws) will serve on the Executive Committee. The chair shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Senate, at any Faculty Forum, and at general faculty meetings upon request by the President of the university. The Chair shall serve as official representative and spokesman of the faculty and Senate in communication with the faculty, and in this capacity shall have ex officio membership upon all major administrative committees. As chief executive officer of the Senate, the Chair shall coordinate and expedite the business of the Senate and its committees (Faculty Code Section 3.20). The chair of the Faculty Senate shall receive 50% released time from regular duties during the term of office (Faculty Code section 7.25);[BYLAWS CHANGE EFFECTIVE WITH ELECTION OF 1994-95 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE]

Rationale: The Faculty Senate has indicated support for strengthening the continuity of its leadership. A change should minimize the impact on departments of releasing a faculty member half-time while maximizing utilization of limited resources. The proposed amendment to the Bylaws ensures a three year commitment to the Senate Executive Committee -- as vice chair, chair and past chair. This should optimize information exchange as well as provide time for departments to plan for the careful replacement of faculty who will be released to the Senate chairship in the year following their election as vice chair.

REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
AGENDA - February 23, 1994

Page 3

MOTION #3: Suspend the following portion of Faculty Bylaws Section III.A. (Officers of the Senate - Procedures for Election), for 1994-95 election ONLY: "Principal officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Senate at the last regular meeting of the Winter Quarter of each academic year" and allow the 1994-95 Faculty Senate Executive Committee to be elected at the first meeting of Spring Quarter 1994, April 6, 1994.

Rationale: Several departments have not yet reported their Senate election results. Delaying the election of the 1994-95 Executive Committee will allow more time for orderly recruitment and nomination. It will also allow time for the Senate to decide on whether or not to compensate the Senate Chair for summer service, and if so, how. Election at the first meeting of Spring Quarter will still provide transition time for the Chair-elect, who will immediately begin attending Deans' Council and Executive Committee meetings.

* * * * *

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR AWARDING HONORS

MEMO (revised 2/3/94)
TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Academic Affairs Committee
Charles McGehee, Chair
DATE: January 31, 1994
RE: Standards and criteria for awarding honors

In a letter dated June 9, 1993, President Nelson noted that 90 percent of the Presidential Scholars honored at the 1991-92 graduation were not only from one school of the university, but from one program, Early Childhood Education. Reviewing the list of Presidential Scholars for the year 1992-93, he found that some 95% of the recipients also came from one school of the university and from the same program, again Early Childhood Education.

President Nelson raised a series of questions to the Senate and others concerning grading practices and standards which may account for this phenomenon and suggested redefining the selection criteria for Presidential Scholars.

Accordingly, the Academic Affairs committee was charged October 15, 1993, to review the standards and criteria for awarding honors and to make recommendations. The Committee has examined the data and evaluated current policy. Following is our report and recommendations:

1. It is the Committee's conclusion that it is beyond the scope and resources of the Committee to undertake evaluation of the grading practices in any particular department. Singling out a department without regard to the problems and issues confronting that department relative to other departments would be tantamount to a witch-hunt. If ECE, for instance, has the highest GPA, which it does, it is inappropriate to evaluate that program exclusively in terms of the perceptions and values of others not party to the issues the program faces.
2. We do believe it appropriate, however, to insure that students of other programs with different academic concerns be given access to honors without direct competition wherein one program might dominate.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - STANDARDS & CRITERIA FOR AWARDING HONORS, cont.'d

Currently, the CWU policy determines honors by general GPA level without regard to school or major. Cum laude is awarded to students with GPA's between 3.4 and 3.59; magna cum laude to students with GPA's between 3.6 and 3.79; and summa cum laude to students 3.8 to 4.00. The designation "Dean's Scholar" is reserved for those with GPA's from 3.6 to 3.94. A "President's Scholar" is a student whose GPA is 3.95 or higher.

The present procedure produces a highly variable number according to the yearly GPA listing. In 1990-91, for instance, there were 19 Presidential Scholars (GPA 3.95 or higher), 3 in B&E, 3 in CLAS, and 13 in SPS. By comparison, there were 30 in 1991-92 with 5 in B&E, 6 in CLAS, and 21 in SPS. In 1992-93 there were 13, of which 2 were from B&E, 3 from CLAS, and 8 from SPS.

Separating the schools for the purpose of naming Presidential and Dean's Scholars would avoid, to some extent, competition among programatically different GPA's. Furthermore, taking a specific percentage of the top GPA's would provide comparability among the schools.

For example, in the academic year 1992-93, there were 626 graduates in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences; 515 in the School of Business and Economics; and 622 in the School of Professional Studies. If one were to have taken, say, the top 1% for Presidential Honors, there would have been six from CLAS with a GPA cutoff of 3.943; five from B&E with a GPA cutoff of 3.916; and six from SPS with a GPA cutoff of 3.967.

The majors represented in CLAS would have been two from Psychology, one Law and Justice, one English, and two Philosophy; in B&E, four from Business Administration and one from Accounting; and in SPS, one from Electrical Engineering Technology, three from Early Childhood Education, one from Elementary Education and one from School Health Education.

The Academic Affairs Committee finds this approach satisfies the goal of providing broad access to high honors while respecting the differences between programs. We therefore recommend the following:

Recommendation No. 1: President's and Dean's Scholars be designated as follows:

President's Scholars -- top 1% of graduates in the current academic year (defined as summer, fall, winter and spring quarters) by school based on cumulative GPA as calculated by existing university policy. (17 for the academic year 1992-93)

Dean's Scholars -- top 5% of graduates in the current academic year but not including the top 1%, by school based on cumulative GPA. (71 for the academic year 1992-93)

This is similar to the current practices at the University of Washington and Western Washington University. Cut off for all honors are decided arbitrarily each year, and at Western they are fixed percentages based on the GPA's of the previous year. The Committee rejects the Western practice because (1) students are being judged relative to a different population and (2) it produces very erratic results. For instance, there would have been 25 President's Scholars in 1991-92 if the cutoff had been based on 1% of the previous year's graduates, whereas 1992-93 would have had 8 President's Scholars if based on 1991-92. One percent of each year, however, would have produced 17 in each year.

The value of using the previous year as the criterion, of course, is in knowing in advance what the cutoff points will be. Under our proposal, the cutoff point would not be known absolutely until after graduation.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - STANDARDS & CRITERIA FOR AWARDING HONORS, cont.'d

Under current CWU policy, honors are designated only preliminarily based on end of Winter quarter data. Students can, and do, advance or lose their position based on final Spring quarter performance, though it is unusual.

We, therefore, recommend the following:

Recommendation No. 2:

Retain the current procedure for establishing honors while substituting the new criteria. That is, the Registrar will calculate the top percentages for declared graduates based on end of Winter quarter data. After Spring quarter graduation when all individual and collective data are in, final determination of honors will be made.

3. As regards general honors, the Academic Affairs Committee proposes retaining the principle of general cutoff levels based on cumulative GPA. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, there is no public comparison between persons as to who receives honors or not and no one is excluded from an award because of the nature of competitive programs. For another, prepublication of the cutoff levels are used widely by students as goals as well as indicators of success. While one might argue that this contributes to a grade-oriented climate, it is nonetheless the case and students value it. Changing to a percentage based procedure would increase anxiety and irritation without providing any clear benefits.

On the other hand, at 3.4 CWU currently has the lowest standards for honors of any public institution in the Washington State and shares the position of lowest with one private institution. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends raising the minimum standard for general honors to the current minimum level for Eastern, Gonzaga, Seattle Pacific, Seattle U., and WSU.

Recommendation No. 3: The standards for general honors should be as follows:

3.5-3.69	cum laude
3.7-3.89	magna cum laude
3.9-4.00	summa cum laude

Recommendation No. 4: The preceding recommendations, if approved, should be implemented starting with the 1994-95 academic year.

End of report.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

PROPOSAL TO ADD GEOLOGY 170 TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

General Education Committee members Don Cummings and John Ressler will attend the 2/23/94 Senate meeting to answer questions concerning the proposed change in the General Education Program.

MOTION: Remove MOTION NO. 2933 from the table: *MOTION NO. 2933 Steve Olson moved approval of the following proposal to change the General Education Program:
Add Geology 170 [Volcanoes, Earthquakes, and Civilization] to the list of non-lab physical science options in the breadth block of the General Education Program.
*MOTION NO. 2934 Charles McGehee moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to table MOTION NO. 2933 until members of the General Education Committee attended a meeting of the Faculty Senate to answer questions regarding the proposal. Motion passed - -- MOTION NO. 2933 tabled.]

[EXCERPT FROM 1/12/94 FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES]:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NEW COURSE: GEOLOGY 170 GEOL 170. Volcanoes, Earthquakes and Civilization (3). The role of catastrophic processes, such as volcanoes and earthquakes, in shaping the earth and the environment and their effects on civilization. Three hours of lecture per week.
RATIONALE: There are few introductory offerings in the physical sciences at Central. The Department of Geology currently lacks an introductory non-laboratory course in geology. This new course change is part of an overall revision of the geology curriculum. [Passed by General Education Committee by a vote of 5 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstention on 12/6/93; passed by Senate Curriculum Committee on 1/6/94.]

Senators questioned why Geology 170 was offered without a lab, whether further changes should be made in view of the upcoming review of the General Education Program, and why a 3 credit course was proposed in the Physical Sciences portion of the General Education Program that requires students to take a minimum of 4 credits. Senator Charles Rubin, Geology, responded that the General Education Committee, of which he is a member, has not yet made plans to begin reviewing the General Education Program. He added that exposure of students to the sciences at Central is "marginal," and addition of another course offering in this area of the General Education Program would allow students more options and be "a step in the right direction" in encouraging wider exposure to broad physical science concepts. Senator Rubin pointed out that Geology does not have a non-lab course offering in the General Education Program, and it would be equitable to add such a course. Senators criticized the Geology Department's rationale for adding the course to the General Education Program and requested clarification from members of the General Education Committee regarding why it had approved the proposal. No members of the General Education Committee, other than Senator Rubin, were present.


RECEIVED

FEB 15 1994

CITY FACULTY SENATE

Memorandum

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: John M. Brangwin, Faculty Senator
ASCWU Representative for Academic Affairs 

Date: February 14, 1994

Subject: Students on Governing Boards

~~~~~

Since the issue of students on governing boards is apparently going to be discussed at our next Senate meeting, I want to further discuss my concerns on this issue and present a motion to be included on the agenda.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate expresses no position on the issue of  
Students on Governing Boards.

My rationale is that it serves no real benefit for the Senate to take a position on this issue. As previously discussed it would only be a philosophical decision regarding the theoretical structure of what the Board should be (disinterested or representative). It is difficult for me to imagine how the faculty would be impacted positively or negatively by the current legislation for a student on the governing board. Certainly the structure of the board would change; however, the addition of the student member would not inherently effect the faculty in any one extreme. Just as any new member of the Board of Trustees might view the faculty negatively or positively, the student member would be just as subject to their opinions. Attempting to speculate what the individual opinions of a prospective student Trustee member might be is premature and most likely impossible anyway. ASCWU's supportive position regarding Students on Governance Boards is based on the premise that students are the consumers of the institution and voting citizens of the state. The student, like all the other members of the Trustees, is an autonomous individual. The student member, as with any issue, may take an opinion differing from the opinion of the ASCWU or the general student population.

If the Senate takes a position on the matter it may tend to bring division between groups on campus. A strongly supportive issue takes a position opposing the administration on an issue comparatively insignificant to other faculty legislative issues. A negative position places the Senate in a situation of stating non-support and no confidence in the ASCWU and in the students in general.

I would appreciate it if you would discuss this issue and then respond in writing with your comments. I would be happy to directly discuss the issue in person at if you feel that would be beneficial.

# 1994-95 FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

| Department         | Years<br>to Serve | Senator                               | Alternate           |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Accounting         | 3                 | VACANCY [ will hold election 2/24/94] |                     |
| Anthropology       |                   |                                       |                     |
| Art                | 3                 | James Sahlstrand                      | Margaret Sahlstrand |
| Biology            | 3                 | VACANCY                               |                     |
| Business Admin     | 3                 | VACANCY                               |                     |
|                    | 2                 | Connie Nott                           |                     |
| BEAM               | 1                 | Rob Perkins                           | Cathy Bertelson     |
| Chemistry          | 1                 | ?                                     |                     |
| Communication      | 3                 | Robert Fordan                         |                     |
| Computer Science   | 3                 | Barry Donahue                         | George Town         |
| Economics          | 1                 | Robert Carbaugh                       | David Hedrick       |
| Education          | 1                 | Linda Beath                           | Dan Fennerty        |
|                    | 3                 | VACANCY                               |                     |
|                    | 2                 | Minerva Caples                        | Susan Donahoe       |
| English            | 1                 | Bobby Cummings                        | Loretta Gray        |
|                    | 3                 | Steven Olson                          | Terry Martin        |
| Foreign Language   | 1                 | Dieter Romboy                         | Stella Moreno       |
| Geography          | 1                 | Morris Uebelacker                     | John Alwin          |
| Geology            | 3                 | VACANCY                               |                     |
| History            | 2                 | Dan Ramsdell                          | Beverly Heckart     |
| Home Economics     | 2                 | Carolyn Schactler                     | Carolyn Thomas      |
| IET                | 3                 | Walter Kaminski                       | Bruce Barnes        |
| Law and Justice    | 1                 | Michael Olivero                       |                     |
| Library            | 3                 | Thomas Yeh                            | Gerard Hogan        |
|                    | 2                 | Robert Myers                          | Patrick Owens       |
| Mathematics        | 3                 | VACANCY                               |                     |
| Music              | 1                 | Sidney Nesselroad                     | Andrew Spencer      |
|                    | 2                 | Eric Roth                             | Geoffrey Boers      |
| Philosophy         | 3                 | Webster Hood                          | Peter Burkholder    |
| Physical Education | 2                 | Vince Nethery                         | Robert Gregson      |
|                    | 2                 | Walter Arlt                           | Stephen Jefferies   |
| Physics            | 1                 | Sharon Rosell                         | Michael Braunstein  |
| Political Science  | 1                 | Rex Wirth                             |                     |
| Psychology         | 3                 | Terry DeVietti                        | Roger Fouts         |
|                    | 2                 | Lisa Weyandt                          | Stephanie Stein     |
| Sociology          | 1                 | Charles McGehee                       | David Kaufman       |
| Theatre Arts       | 3                 | Jim Hawkins                           | Mark Zetterberg     |
| President/Provost  |                   | Ivory Nelson                          | Thomas Moore        |
| ASCWU/BOD          |                   | Mary Gossage                          | Jeff Olsen          |
|                    |                   | Kristan Starbuck                      | Shawn Christie      |
|                    |                   | John Brangwin                         | Kris Henry          |

(February 18, 1994 2ROSTER.94)



## ROLL CALL 1993-94

## FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 23, 1994

☒ Walter ARLT  
☐ Linda BEATH  
☒ Andrea BOWMAN  
☒ John BRANGWIN  
☒ Peter BURKHOLDER  
☐ Minerva CAPLES  
☐ Robert CARBAUGH  
☒ David CARNS  
☒ Bobby CUMMINGS  
☒ Barry DONAHUE  
☒ Ken GAMON  
☒ Mary GOSSAGE  
☒ Charles MCGEHEE  
☐ Deborah MEDLAR  
☒ Robert MYERS  
☒ Ivory NELSON  
☐ Connie NOTT  
☒ Sidney NESSELROAD  
☒ Vince NETHERY  
☐ Michael OLIVERO  
☒ Steve OLSON  
☒ Rob PERKINS  
☒ Dan RAMSDELL  
☒ Dieter ROMBOY  
☒ Sharon ROSELL  
☒ Eric ROTH  
☐ Charles RUBIN  
☐ James SAHLSTRAND  
☐ Carolyn SCHACTLER  
☒ Hugh SPALL  
☒ Kristan STARBUCK  
☒ Stephanie STEIN  
☐ Alan TAYLOR  
☐ Thomas THELEN  
☒ Morris UEBELACKER  
☒ Lisa WEYANDT [pron. Y'-ANT]  
☒ Rex WIRTH  
☒ Thomas YEH  
☒ Mark ZETTERBERG

☐ Stephen JEFFERIES  
☐ Dan FENNERTY  
☐ Madalon LALLEY  
☐ Kris HENRY  
☐ Jay BACHRACH  
☒ Susan DONAHOE  
☐ David HEDRICK  
☐ Walt KAMINSKI  
☐ George TOWN  
☐ James HARPER  
☐ Jeff OLSEN  
☐ David KAUFMAN  
☐ Gary HEESACKER  
☐ Patrick OWENS  
☐ Thomas MOORE  
☐ Andrew SPENCER  
☐ Robert GREGSON  
☐ Cathy BERTELSON  
☐ Beverly HECKART  
☐ Stella MORENO  
☐ Michael BRAUNSTEIN  
☐ Geoffrey BOERS  
☐ James HINTHORNE  
☐ Margaret SAHLSTRAND  
☐ Carolyn THOMAS  
☐ Shawn CHRISTIE  
☐ Stephen SCHEPMAN  
☐ Robert GARRETT  
☐ John CARR  
☐ John ALWIN  
☐ Roger FOUTS  
☐ Jerry HOGAN  
☐ Wesley VAN TASSEL

February 23, 1994

Date

**VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET**

Carolyn Wells

Jeff Ober

Anne Newman

Don Cummings

JOHN RESSLER

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.

Central  
Washington  
University



Department of Physical Education,  
Health Education, Leisure Services

Nicholson Pavilion  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1911

RECEIVED

FEB 08 1994

OWU FACULTY / STAFF

February 7, 1994.

Sidney L. Nesselroad, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Barge Hall 409  
Campus

Dear Mr. Nesselroad:

Because I will not be on campus spring quarter I wish to submit my resignation from the International Programs Advisory Committee.

I have spoken with Mr. Stephen Jefferies of the Physical Education Department about this committee assignment and he has indicated that he would be interested in serving on the committee if it should be your wishes. Mr. Jefferies has been involved in international education and would bring both interest and knowledge to the committee.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

James G. Nylander  
Professor of Physical Education

cc: Stella Moreno, Chair,  
International Programs Advisory Committee  
Foreign Language Department, L. & L. Building, Campus

①



## CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

### MEMO (revised 2/3/94)

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Academic Affairs Committee  
Charles McGehee, Chair

DATE: January 31, 1994

RE: Standards and criteria for awarding honors

In a letter dated June 9, 1993, President Nelson noted that 90 percent of the Presidential Scholars honored at the 1991-92 graduation were not only from one school of the university, but from one program, Early Childhood Education. Reviewing the list of Presidential Scholars for the year 1992-93, he found that some 95% of the recipients also came from one school of the university and from the same program, again Early Childhood Education.

President Nelson raised a series of questions to the Senate and others concerning grading practices and standards which may account for this phenomenon and suggested redefining the selection criteria for Presidential Scholars.

Accordingly, the Academic Affairs committee was charged October 15, 1993, to review the standards and criteria for awarding honors and to make recommendations. The Committee has examined the data and evaluated current policy. Following is our report and recommendations:

1. It is the Committee's conclusion that it is beyond the scope and resources of the Committee to undertake evaluation of the grading practices in any particular department. Singling out a department without regard to the problems and issues confronting that department relative to other departments would be tantamount to a witch-hunt. If ECE, for instance, has the highest GPA, which it does, it is inappropriate to evaluate that program exclusively in terms of the perceptions and values of others not party to the issues the program faces.
2. We do believe it appropriate, however, to insure that students of other programs with different academic concerns be given access to honors without direct competition wherein one program might dominate.

Currently, the CWU policy determines honors by general GPA level without regard to school or major. Cum laude is awarded to students with GPA's between 3.4 and 3.59; magna cum laude to students with GPA's between 3.6 and 3.79; and summa cum laude to students 3.8 to 4.00. The designation "Dean's Scholar" is reserved for those with GPA's from 3.6 to 3.94. A "President's Scholar" is a student whose GPA is 3.95 or higher.

The present procedure produces a highly variable number according to the yearly GPA listing. In 1990-91, for instance, there were 19 Presidential Scholars (GPA 3.95 or higher), 3 in B&E, 3 in CLAS, and 13 in SPS. By comparison, there were 30 in 1991-92 with 5 in B&E, 6 in CLAS, and 21 in SPS. In 1992-93 there were 13, of which 2 were from B&E, 3 from CLAS, and 8 from SPS.

Separating the schools for the purpose of naming Presidential and Dean's Scholars would avoid, to some extent, competition among programatically different GPA's. Furthermore, taking a specific percentage of the top GPA's would provide comparability among the schools.

For example, in the academic year 1992-93, there were 626 graduates in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences; 515 in the School of Business and Economics; and 622 in the School of Professional Studies. If one were to have taken, say, the top 1% for Presidential Honors, there would have been six from CLAS with a GPA cutoff of 3.943; five from B&E with a GPA cutoff of 3.916; and six from SPS with a GPA cutoff of 3.967.

The majors represented in CLAS would have been two from Psychology, one Law and Justice, one English, and two Philosophy; in B&E, four from Business Administration and one from Accounting; and in SPS, one from Electrical Engineering Technology, three from Early Childhood Education, one from Elementary Education and one from School Health Education.

The Academic Affairs Committee finds this approach satisfies the goal of providing broad access to high honors while respecting the differences between programs. We therefore recommend the following:

Recommendation No. 1: President's and Dean's Scholars be designated as follows:

President's Scholars -- top 1% of graduates in the current academic year (defined as summer, fall, winter and spring quarters) by school based on cumulative GPA as calculated by existing university policy. (17 for the academic year 1992-93)

Dean's Scholars -- top 5% of graduates in the current academic year but not including the top 1%, by school based on cumulative GPA. (71 for the academic year 1992-93)

This is similar to the current practices at the University of Washington and Western Washington University. Cut off for all honors are decided arbitrarily each year, and at Western they are fixed percentages based on the GPA's of the previous year. The Committee rejects the Western practice because (1) students are being judged relative to a different population and (2) it produces very erratic results. For instance, there would have been 25 President's Scholars in 1991-92 if the cutoff had been based on 1% of the previous year's graduates, whereas 1992-93 would have had 8 President's Scholars if based on 1991-92. One percent of each year, however, would have produced 17 in each year.

The value of using the previous year as the criterion, of course, is in knowing in advance what the cutoff points will be. Under our proposal, the cutoff point would not be known absolutely until after graduation. Under current CWU policy, honors are designated only preliminarily based on end of Winter quarter data. Students can, and do, advance or lose their position based on final Spring quarter performance, though it is unusual.

We, therefore, recommend the following:

Recommendation No. 2:

Retain the current procedure for establishing honors while substituting the new criteria. That is, the Registrar will calculate the top percentages for declared graduates based on end of Winter quarter data. After Spring quarter graduation when all individual and collective data are in, final determination of honors will be made.

3. As regards general honors, the Academic Affairs Committee proposes retaining the principle of general cutoff levels based on cumulative GPA. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, there is no public comparison between persons as to who receives honors or not and no one is excluded from an award because of the nature of competitive programs. For another, prepublication

of the cutoff levels are used widely by students as goals as well as indicators of success. While one might argue that this contributes to a grade-oriented climate, it is nonetheless the case and students value it. Changing to a percentage based procedure would increase anxiety and irritation without providing any clear benefits.

On the other hand, at 3.4 CWU currently has the lowest standards for honors of any public institution in the Washington State and shares the position of lowest with one private institution. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends raising the minimum standard for general honors to the current minimum level for Eastern, Gonzaga, Seattle Pacific, Seattle U., and WSU.

Recommendation No. 3: The standards for general honors should be as follows:

- 3.5-3.69 cum laude
- 3.7-3.89 magna cum laude
- 3.9-4.00 summa cum laude

Recommendation No. 4: The preceding recommendations, if approved, should be implemented starting with the 1994-95 academic year.

End of report.



RECEIVED

FEB 15 1994

CNW FACULTY SENATE

## Memorandum

**To:** Faculty Senate Executive Committee

**From:** John M. Brangwin, Faculty Senator  
ASCWU Representative for Academic Affairs

**Date:** February 14, 1994

**Subject:** Students on Governing Boards



~~~~~

Since the issue of students on governing boards is apparently going to be discussed at our next Senate meeting, I want to further discuss my concerns on this issue and present a motion to be included on the agenda.

Motion: The Faculty Senate expresses no position on the issue of Students on Governing Boards.

My rationale is that it serves no real benefit for the Senate to take a position on this issue. As previously discussed it would only be a philosophical decision regarding the theoretical structure of what the Board should be (disinterested or representative). It is difficult for me to imagine how the faculty would be impacted positively or negatively by the current legislation for a student on the governing board. Certainly the structure of the board would change; however, the addition of the student member would not inherently effect the faculty in any one extreme. Just as any new member of the Board of Trustees might view the faculty negatively or positively, the student member would be just as subject to their opinions. Attempting to speculate what the individual opinions of a prospective student Trustee member might be is premature and most likely impossible anyway. ASCWU's supportive position regarding Students on Governance Boards is based on the premise that students are the consumers of the institution and voting citizens of the state. The student, like all the other members of the Trustees, is an autonomous individual. The student member, as with any issue, may take an opinion differing from the opinion of the ASCWU or the general student population.

If the Senate takes a position on the matter it may tend to bring division between groups on campus. A strongly supportive issue takes a position opposing the administration on an issue comparatively insignificant to other faculty legislative issues. A negative position places the Senate in a situation of stating non-support and no confidence in the ASCWU and in the students in general.

I would appreciate it if you would discuss this issue and then respond in writing with your comments. I would be happy to directly discuss the issue in person at if you feel that would be beneficial.

6

Central
Washington
University



Department of Psychology
Ellensburg, Washington 98926
(509) 963-2381

February 7, 1994

To: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Senate Executive Committee

From: Libby Street, Chair *Libby*
Senate Personnel Committee

You may recall that during fall quarter, you asked the Personnel Committee to become involved in discussions regarding the Faculty Analysis Form. By the time we received the request, work was well under way on the form that would be distributed to collect fall quarter information. However, Connie Roberts indicated that she would like to talk to our committee in the event we had suggestions that might improve data collection for future quarters. Connie attended our January 6th meeting and answered a number of questions and heard some of our concerns. While we feel Connie was attentive to what we had to say, we have a few concerns that we'd like to make a matter of the record and that we'd specifically like for the Senate Executive Committee to consider.

First, we continue to be concerned about the manner in which data are being collected. The lack of scientific rigor being brought to bear on the data collection process is frustrating. Unless data are being collected solely as an exercise in paper work and will not be used for decision making or public relations, the current procedure yields data of no value. We do not mean to suggest that faculty members will purposely distort the data, only that virtually everything we know about data collection suggests that historical guessing about behavior results in very low reliability information.

Second, we are concerned that there are no clear indications about how the data will be used. Clearly we are unlikely to have any input into the use of these data by the Higher Education Coordinating Board; however, the members of the committee feel that the faculty should have some input into and assurances about how the data will be used on this campus. Members of the committee have participated in various discussions with administrators across campus and find a great deal of inconsistency in the assertions about how the data will be used. That it is data of unproven reliability and is being collected in the manner it is only because the HEC Board has dictated the procedure, we would hope that it would be put to NO use on this campus; would not be a component of decision making. Would it be possible to have a clear statement from the Provost or the President about current intent?

Third and perhaps most importantly, we are concerned that "number of minutes of activity" of faculty is being equated with productivity. It is somewhat like grading public school children on the basis of their effort rather than their achievement. We recognize the difficulty in finding commonly accepted standards for outcomes of a university; we also recognize that some measure of efficiency of achieving outcomes is important. We are simply concerned that an incredibly simplistic perspective is being taken in assessing faculty commitment and effectiveness and request that the university administration and board actively discourage this perspective both in their discussions with governing bodies and in their personal discussions about faculty excellence. Further, we request additional dialog between faculty and

①

administrators to establish other outcome data that might provide a clearer picture of our effectiveness.

At this point, our Committee will assume we have no additional responsibilities with respect to this charge unless we hear from you again. We do, however, encourage you to pursue the issues we've addressed.

Central
Washington
University



Department of Psychology
Ellensburg, Washington 98926
(509) 963-2381

February 7, 1994

RECEIVED
FEB 8 1994
CRU FACULTY SENATE

To: Sid Nesselroad, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: Libby Street, Chair *Libby*
Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

Re: University Minority and Diversity Action Plan

We received your November 29th charge to address tasks that the Board of Trustees had assigned to the Personnel and Code Committees of the Senate re: the University Minority Participation and Diversity Action Plan. We have discussed the two strategies for which you asked us to coordinate with the Code Committee and have the following comments:

You included Don Schliesman's letter describing the two strategies with which we are asked to help. Both use the term minority but don't define it. Is it possible for us to receive the working definition we have adopted on this campus or that has been adopted for us?

With regard to Goal 6, Strategy 1, we have reviewed the faculty code and find the policies dictating the receipt of tenure and promotion to be non-discriminatory. We recognize that implementation of policies may be very different from the intent set forth in the code; however, the Code in no way disadvantages an individual for reasons of ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or race.

With regard to Goal 6, Strategy 2, we believe it would be valuable for the university to assess hiring, promotion, tenure, and salary adjustment criteria as they are implemented by individual departments. However, we feel the development of assessment strategies should be undertaken by either the Affirmative Action Office or the Office of Institutional Research. It seems to us that the role of our committee and the Code Committee is to review the instruments that are developed, the procedures for gathering data, and the data when they are available. We will look forward to working with either the Affirmative Action Office or the Office of Institutional Research in these ways but we do request that the administrative personnel assigned to those offices are more appropriate for the task of researching and designing effective instruments. We did note that departments and deans are to be surveyed. We recommend the departmental surveys be addressed to individual faculty members. Each individual faculty member is a better judge of perceived discrimination than a department chair might be. Further, we recommend some strategy that would allow candidates for positions to have an exit interview with or complete a questionnaire from affirmative action in which they confidentially describe their perspectives on fairness of our practices.

pc. Beverly Heckert, Chair
Senate Code Committee

8

Major Legislative Issues and Status
February 11, 1994
Day 33 of 60 Day Session

ISSUES AND INFORMATION:

SB 6519 School Employee Salary Increases

Sponsor: Dan McDonald, John Moyer

Status: Holding in Senate Ways & Means

Key Components:

Provides for a salary increase for K-12 school personnel, and incremental increases for community college personnel, by cutting the equipment and travel budget of the remainder of state government 12.5% across-the-board. Disproportionately cuts higher education (over half of the cuts would come from higher ed).

HB 2147 Exempting Institutions of Hi Ed from Certain Expenditure Requirements

Sponsor: Don Carlson

Status: Passed House Hi Ed, Passed Approps

Key Components:

Exempts higher ed institutions from budget and accounting requirement to spend state appropriated and non-state appropriated funds in a ratio that conserves state appropriated funds.

SB 6438 Include 4 Year Institutions in Running Start

Sponsor: Al Bauer

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Passed Ways & Means

Key Components:

Allows four-year institutions to participate in the running start program for high school students in the same manner that community colleges currently participate.

HB 2605 Higher Education "Emancipation"

Sponsor: Representative Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed (as amended), Passed Appropriations

Key Components:

NOTE: **Bold** = ICLO supports

Italic = ICLO opposes

Plain = ICLO split or undecided

**=provision amended out of bill

1. Gives institutional governing boards control over tuition rate-setting authority, with an upper limit based on a calculation of putting the institution in the 90th

10A

percentile (using HECB peers as a guide) in quality funding in the nation by the year 2002. Amended in House Approps to limit tuition increases to no more than 10% at any one time.

NOTE: Attorney General's opinion is that tuition is not covered by 601 restrictions if it remains with the legislature, and is covered by 601 if tuition is set at the discretion of institutional governing boards.

****2. Eliminates bid limits for contracting jobs within institutions.**

3. Allows institutions to carry-forward tuition money at the end of a biennium, rather than returning savings to the state.

4. No salary restrictions set by the state. Institutions may offer merit pay with money saved on projects or money retained at the end of a biennium.

5. Simplifies allotment requirements between institutions and OFM.

6. Raises amount of tuition required to be deposited in a local financial aid fund from the current 2.5% to 5%.

***7. Gives HECB authority to distribute all new enrollments funded by the state. Enrollments can be given to either public or private institutions, based on the HECB's assessment of cost effectiveness and quality.*

***8. Removes HECB authority for new program review.*

***9. Removes HECB authority to moderate off-campus disputes between institutions.*

10. Allows institutions to contract out for services.

11. Building fees, local capital funds and program fees are at the discretion of the institution -- no limit on amount or percentage of tuition that would go to such local accounts.

12. Approps amendment creates a scheme for providing financial aid to college students of families with incomes of up to 125% of the median (median = \$41,000/family of four).

SHB 1005 Students on Governing Boards

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House 80 - 14. No action scheduled in Senate.

Key Components:

Requires regional universities and TESC to have one student on their Boards of Trustees. Requires research universities to have two students on their Boards of Regents (1 undergrad, 1 grad).

HB 2327 Core Services for Disabled Students

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen (at the request of the Governor)

Status: Passed House Higher Education, Passed Approps. Action scheduled on floor.

Key Components:

Amplifies ADA requirements and lists 16 core services for disabled students that institutions should provide at the request of a student.

HB 1674 Changing Residency Status for Native Americans

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed; Passed Senate Hi Ed, **Passed Senate** (as amended).

Key Components:

Gives Washington residency status (for tuition purposes) to students of Native American ancestry whose traditional tribal domain is within the state of Washington. Amended on Senate floor to apply only to Native Americans living in Idaho, Oregon, and Montana.

SSB 6481 Student S & A Fees

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen/Al Bauer

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed 2-2-94 (as amended), Passed Ways & Means. Scheduled for floor vote.

Key Components:

Changes authority to make transfers of S & A funds after a budget has been approved.

SB 6362 Higher Education Efficiency

Sponsor: Al Bauer by request of OFM

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Passed Ways & Means.

Key Components:

Legislation has two provisions: raises bid limits for four year higher ed institutions from the current \$25,000 to \$50,000; and exempts institutions from provisions of budget and accounting act that require institutions spend funds in a manner which conserves state appropriated monies (allows for tuition carry-forward).

Major Legislation now Dead

HB 2322 College/University Legal Counsel

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: DEAD

Bill allows institutions of higher education to contract for legal counsel from the private sector, rather than using counsel assigned from the state Attorney General's office.

SHB 1468/ SB 6361 Faculty Collective Bargaining

Sponsor: Mike Heavey

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Enabling legislation to allow faculty at institutions to bargain collectively.

Note: UW and WSU are going to be written out of the bill (at their request). Their faculties support collective bargaining in principle, but believe this bill is a bad vehicle because: 1) agreements reached under collective bargaining could override faculty code; 2) tenure track faculty are in one bargaining unit and other faculty in another; 3) it is not clear what would be subject to bargaining.

HB 2473 Public Agency Lobbyists

Sponsor: Holly Meyer

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

States that any public institution or agency may have only one lobbyist (according to PDC regulations) on the state payroll.

HB 2454 Sporting Events Violence

Sponsor: Steve Van Luven (note: Gary Chandler is a co-sponsor)

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Makes it a misdemeanor for an athlete or a coach to engage in a "violent act that does not reasonably further the goal or purpose of the sport the person is participating in...."

HB ZZZZ Institutional Task Forces on Issues of Concern to Students

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Directs institutions to create a task force to discuss legislative issues of concern with students, including but not limited to issues such as students on governing boards, negative check off for voluntary students fees, and the distribution of S & A fees.

HB 2403 Higher Education added tuition/fees for long time students

Sponsor: Helen Sommers

Status: Failed in House Hi Ed 2-3-94.

Key Components:

Bill would require that students pay 20% more tuition when they have accumulated credits beyond 115% of those required for their particular degree program.

SB 5894 Student Progression Agreements

Sponsor: Kevin Quigley

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed 1-31-94 (as amended) Died in Ways & Means.

Key Components:

At the request of an entering student, an institution must enter a signed agreement with student to guarantee that access to courses required for receiving a degree will be available in order for the student to finish in a timely (i.e. 4 years for most degrees) manner. The student must agree to take a sufficient course load to enable them to complete their degree in the stipulated time.

SB 5893 Higher Ed Grants to Loans

Sponsors: Kevin Quigley and Harold Hochstatter

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Died in Ways & Means

Key Components:

Changes state financial aid provisions so that 70% of student financial aid will be provided in the form of loans rather than grants. The remaining 30% will be distributed primarily in the form of work study money.

HB 2773 Higher Ed Minimum Wage

Sponsors: Mike Heavey, Ken Jacobsen

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Allows institutions of higher ed to employ students at 85% of minimum wage when both institution and student meet certain requirements.

HB 2528 College Promise Enacted/ 601 Clarifying Language

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed, Died in Approps (college promise amended to 2605)

Key Components:

Creates a scheme for providing financial aid to college students of families with incomes of up to 125% of the median (median = \$41,000/family of four). Also provided clarifying language for tuition and other institutional fees to be outside the requirements of Initiative 601.

HB 1364 Check Off for Student Organizations Support

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Higher Education (as amended), Died in Approps

Key Components:

Allows student organizations to collect voluntary students fees for their support using institutional registration system. Students may use either positive or negative check-off.

RECEIVED

JAN 28 1994

CWU FACULTY SENATE

January 27, 1994

Dr. Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Faculty Senate
C.W.U.

Dear Sid:

At its January 18 meeting the University General Education Committee discussed the fate in the Senate of our recommendations concerning Geology's General Education offerings. We decided that we would like to have representatives in attendance when the Senate removed the question of Geology 170 from the table. John Ressler and I were selected as those representatives. Please inform us of when you expect the item to be next discussed in the Senate.

Sincerely,



D. W. Cummings, Chair
University General Education Committee

c: Bob Brown, John Ressler, Meghan Miller

10B



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

TO: Don Cummings, Chair
General Education Committee

John Ressler, Geography
Member, General Education Committee

FROM: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Faculty Senate

DATE: January 31, 1994

RE: **PROPOSED CHANGE TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: GEOLOGY 170**

Thank you for agreeing to attend the February 23, 1994 Faculty Senate meeting to answer Senators' questions concerning the proposed addition of Geology 170 [Volcanoes, Earthquakes and Civilization] to the General Education Program:

**Faculty Senate Meeting
3:10 p.m.
Wednesday, February 23, 1994
SUB 204-205**

Attached for your information is the Curriculum Committee report from the January 12, 1994, Faculty Senate minutes.

c: Robert Brown, Dean of CLAS
Meghan Miller, Chair, Geology
Charles Rubin, Geology
Steve Olson, English - Senate Curriculum Committee
Wesley Van Tassel, Theatre Arts - Chair, Senate Curriculum Committee

sft

[c:\wpdocs\agendas\2-23-94.gcd]

4. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

*MOTION NO. 2932 Steve Olson moved approval of the following proposal to change the General Education Program:

Delete Geology 345 [Principles of Geology] and its lab from the list of physical science offerings in the breadth block and replace it with new course Geology 150 [Geology of National Parks], to be taken concurrently with a lab section, Geology 145.1 [Physical Geology Laboratory].

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: COURSE CHANGE (REPLACES GEOL 305 -- Geology of Western National Parks, 2 credits): GEOLOGY 150 GEOL 150. Geology of National Parks (4).

The geological history and primary geological landforms of selected national parks and monuments in North America. Four lectures per week. Geology 145.1 must be taken concurrently. Students cannot receive credit in both GEOL 150 and GEOL 145 [Physical Geology]. GEOL 150 is a prerequisite for the following courses: GEOL 200 (Global Change and Earth Evolution), GEOL 210 (Introduction to Geologic Field Methods), GEOL 346 (Mineralogy). RATIONALE: This class change is part of a complete revision of the geology curriculum. The content of National Parks has been changed to reflect completely new content, thus a change in description. The number changes will make it part of the beginning classes in the geology major and for non-majors that desire an overview of the earth systems. Basic geologic principles will be taught using the National Parks as an example. Students will register for Geology 145.1 laboratory concurrently. [Passed unanimously by General Education Committee on 12/6/93; passed by Senate Curriculum Committee on 1/6/94.]

Senators asked why Geology 150 was not assigned its own numbered lab section, why the 300 level course currently in the General Education Program was being replaced by a 100 level course, and how the subject matter of Geology 150 differs from that of Geology 145. Senator Charles Rubin, Geology, responded that the Geology Department recently completed an extensive revision of its entire curriculum, including changes in course levels and numbering; Geology 150 differs from Geology 145 in that general geological principles are illustrated through a textbook and instruction based on the geology of the national park system; the Geology 145 lab covers material that is appropriate and applicable for Geology 150. Senator Rubin stated that the Geology Department added Geology 150 to its curriculum as a "more interesting alternative" to Geology 145 and pointed out that the textbook used in Geology 150 was produced by the instructor who would be teaching the course; Senators questioned whether these motivations were sufficient to change the content of the General Education Program.

MOTION NO. 2932 passed (28 yes, 2 no, 3 abstentions).

* * * * *

*MOTION NO. 2933 Steve Olson moved approval of the following proposal to change the General Education Program:

Add Geology 170 [Volcanoes, Earthquakes, and Civilization] to the list of non-lab physical science options in the breadth block of the General Education Program.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NEW COURSE: GEOLOGY 170 GEOL 170. Volcanoes, Earthquakes and Civilization (3). The role of catastrophic processes, such as volcanoes and earthquakes, in shaping the earth and the environment and their effects on civilization. Three hours of lecture per week. RATIONALE: There are few introductory offerings in the physical sciences at Central. The Department of Geology currently lacks an introductory non-laboratory course in geology. This new course change is part of an overall revision of the geology curriculum. [Passed by General Education Committee by a vote of 5 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstention on 12/6/93; passed by Senate Curriculum Committee on 1/6/94.]

Senators questioned why Geology 170 was offered without a lab, whether further changes should be made in view of the upcoming review of the General Education Program, and why a 3 credit course was proposed in the Physical Sciences portion of the General Education Program that requires students to take a minimum of 4 credits. Senator Charles Rubin, Geology, responded that the General Education Committee, of which he is a member, has not yet made plans to begin reviewing the

4. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

General Education Program. He added that exposure of students to the sciences at Central is "marginal," and addition of another course offering in this area of the General Education Program would allow students more options and be "a step in the right direction" in encouraging wider exposure to broad physical science concepts. Senator Rubin pointed out that Geology does not have a non-lab course offering in the General Education Program, and it would be equitable to add such a course. Senators criticized the Geology Department's rationale for adding the course to the General Education Program and requested clarification from members of the General Education Committee regarding why it had approved the proposal. No members of the General Education Committee, other than Senator Rubin, were present.

*MOTION NO. 2934 Charles McGehee moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to table MOTION NO. 2933 until members of the General Education Committee attended a meeting of the Faculty Senate to answer questions regarding the proposal. Motion passed --- MOTION NO. 2933 tabled.

5. VICE PRESIDENT FOR UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT

Mark Young, Vice President for University Advancement, distributed copies of the university's new "Fundraising Initiative Process," which was approved by the President's Cabinet on November 8, 1993. Mr. Young explained that the 12-step process for projects attempting to raise more than \$10,000 was developed in order to coordinate fundraising efforts and reduce multiple solicitations on behalf of the university to its various constituencies.

6. DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES

Jim Haskett, Director of Information Resources, distributed information from the Management Information System (MIS) Committee regarding use of INTERNET and its "gopher" server. Due to time constraints, Mr. Haskett's report was continued to the February 2, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

* * * * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: February 2, 1994 * * * * *



FACULTY SENATE

PLEASE ROUTE TO: PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

NAME: _____

DATE: January 31, 1994

REFERENCE: Salary Adjustment Proposal

MESSAGE: For your information

☐ PLEASE ANSWER

☐ Your signature

☐ CC to me

☐ Prepare rough draft for me

☐ Prepare answer for us to co-sign

☐ Prepare answer for my signature

☐ LET'S DISCUSS

☐ Please phone me

☐ Let's meet. Time: _____

☐ Please advise me on action to be taken

☐ Please review for accuracy

☐ If inaccurate, report inaccuracies to: _____

☐ FOR YOUR ACTION

☐ Please follow up

☐ Please keep me posted

☐ Action requested by: _____

☐ For your approval

☐ Supply info and return

☐ Please return with your evaluation

☐ Refer or delegate to others

☒ FOR YOUR INFORMATION

☐ Please return to me

☐ Please return for filing

☐ Need not return

☐ For your files. Send to:

☐ Library

☐ _____

☐ RETURNED WITH THANKS



MEMORANDUM

TO: CWU Faculty Senate
FROM: Economics Faculty
DATE: 28 January 1994
RE: Initial Ruminations on Senate "Merit" proposal

RECEIVED

JAN 31 1994

CWU FACULTY SENATE

We are offering below recommendations to improve the existing document. In general, we find that the criteria Level II as listed make up a satisfactory minimum base for a first merit step. Anything less than those requirements would clearly be considered to be an "across the board" salary increase, as everyone in the faculty should be performing at that level.

If criteria for Level II are to be used for Level I, what would then comprise a revised Level II? Let's look at each area:

Teaching Criteria II:

As a minimum for a second merit step increase, teaching evaluations by students (and peers) should indicate that the candidate for merit performs 10% above the SBE mean and 20% above the University mean for standardized evaluation.

Scholarship Criteria II:

Option One: The candidate must publish at least one article in a juried journal, publish a book, develop an academic grant funded at a minimum of the candidate's annual salary, or develop a major regional artistic performance/production.

Option Two: The candidate must achieve three of the original Level II list. Note: Delete "submitted articles" from consideration.

Service Criteria II:

Must serve on one major University committee, one School committee, plus 4 areas on list.

c:\wpwin\rsm\corres\facsen.rsm

100



FACULTY SENATE

PLEASE ROUTE TO: Faculty Senate Code Committee:

NAME: All Members

DATE: February 3, 1994

REFERENCE: Provost's request (7/23/93)

MESSAGE: _____

☐ PLEASE ANSWER

☐ Your signature

☐ CC to me

☐ Prepare rough draft for me

☐ Prepare answer for us to co-sign

☐ Prepare answer for my signature

☐ FOR YOUR ACTION

☐ Please follow up

☐ Please keep me posted

☐ Action requested by: _____

☐ For your approval

☐ Supply info and return

☐ Please return with your evaluation

☐ Refer or delegate to others

☐ LET'S DISCUSS

☐ Please phone me

☐ Let's meet. Time: _____

☐ Please advise me on action to be taken

☐ Please review for accuracy

☐ If inaccurate, report inaccuracies to: _____

☒ FOR YOUR INFORMATION

☐ Please return to me

☐ Please return for filing

☐ Need not return

☐ For your files. Send to:

☐ Library

☐ _____

☐ RETURNED WITH THANKS

Central
Washington
University



Office of the Provost and
Vice President for Academic Affairs

208B Bouillon
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1401

RECEIVED

FEB 02 1994

CHU FACULTY SENATE

February 1, 1994

(94-015.PRV)

Dr. Sidney Nesselroad
Faculty Senate Chair
Campus -- 7509

Dear Sid:

Last summer you and I discussed my request that the Provost become a member of the Senate. Shortly thereafter, I forwarded my request through a letter dated July 23, 1993. Considerable time has passed without reply and, as far as I know, the matter has not been discussed by the appropriate committee. I am chagrined by the lack of response from the committee. It suggests a lack of professional courtesy and perhaps more. Given my view that this is essentially a faculty matter, and not one of personal advocacy, I respectfully withdraw my request. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Moore
Provost/Vice President
for Academic Affairs

/kb

100



MEMORANDUM

TO: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Faculty Senate

FROM: Lin D. Douglas, Associate Dean

DATE: February 3, 1994

RE: Writing Competency

Per your request during the Dean's Council meeting, I am writing to share with you that, as part of the Center for the Preparation of School Personnel, an ad hoc committee was created to discuss writing competency as it relates to teacher program admission/preparation. I am chairing that committee.

We have scheduled Judith Kleck to meet with the committee next week to discuss how our efforts/concerns might interface with those of Judith's task. Our primary concern is that we can insure that our teacher candidates are proficient in the area of writing. While we have discussed identifying "writing intensive" courses within the majors, minor and/or professional education sequence and requesting Center faculty to incorporate writing/language competencies within their respective syllabi, we are open to other suggestions. Certainly, if there is to be a campus-wide solution to this concern, we would want to be supportive of those efforts.

Let me know if there are ways to coordinate with other folks who are tackling this issue. Otherwise, we'll proceed along our own course.

ck

10E

Central
Washington
University



Department of Psychology
Ellensburg, Washington 98926
(509) 963-2381

February 7, 1994

To: Sidney Nesselroad, Chair
Senate Executive Committee

From: Libby Street, Chair *Libby Street*
Senate Personnel Committee

You may recall that during fall quarter, you asked the Personnel Committee to become involved in discussions regarding the Faculty Analysis Form. By the time we received the request, work was well under way on the form that would be distributed to collect fall quarter information. However, Connie Roberts indicated that she would like to talk to our committee in the event we had suggestions that might improve data collection for future quarters. Connie attended our January 6th meeting and answered a number of questions and heard some of our concerns. While we feel Connie was attentive to what we had to say, we have a few concerns that we'd like to make a matter of the record and that we'd specifically like for the Senate Executive Committee to consider.

First, we continue to be concerned about the manner in which data are being collected. The lack of scientific rigor being brought to bear on the data collection process is frustrating. Unless data are being collected solely as an exercise in paper work and will not be used for decision making or public relations, the current procedure yields data of no value. We do not mean to suggest that faculty members will purposely distort the data, only that virtually everything we know about data collection suggests that historical guessing about behavior results in very low reliability information.

Second, we are concerned that there are no clear indications about how the data will be used. Clearly we are unlikely to have any input into the use of these data by the Higher Education Coordinating Board; however, the members of the committee feel that the faculty should have some input into and assurances about how the data will be used on this campus. Members of the committee have participated in various discussions with administrators across campus and find a great deal of inconsistency in the assertions about how the data will be used. That it is data of unproven reliability and is being collected in the manner it is only because the HEC Board has dictated the procedure, we would hope that it would be put to NO use on this campus; would not be a component of decision making. Would it be possible to have a clear statement from the Provost or the President about current intent?

Third and perhaps most importantly, we are concerned that "number of minutes of activity" of faculty is being equated with productivity. It is somewhat like grading public school children on the basis of their effort rather than their achievement. We recognize the difficulty in finding commonly accepted standards for outcomes of a university; we also recognize that some measure of efficiency of achieving outcomes is important. We are simply concerned that an incredibly simplistic perspective is being taken in assessing faculty commitment and effectiveness and request that the university administration and board actively discourage this perspective both in their discussions with governing bodies and in their personal discussions about faculty excellence. Further, we request additional dialog between faculty and

administrators to establish other outcome data that might provide a clearer picture of our effectiveness.

At this point, our Committee will assume we have no additional responsibilities with respect to this charge unless we hear from you again. We do, however, encourage you to pursue the issues we've addressed.

Major Legislative Issues and Status
February 11, 1994
Day 33 of 60 Day Session

ISSUES AND INFORMATION:

SB 6519 School Employee Salary Increases

Sponsor: Dan McDonald, John Moyer

Status: Holding in Senate Ways & Means

Key Components:

Provides for a salary increase for K-12 school personnel, and incremental increases for community college personnel, by cutting the equipment and travel budget of the remainder of state government 12.5% across-the-board. Disproportionately cuts higher education (over half of the cuts would come from higher ed).

HB 2147 Exempting Institutions of Hi Ed from Certain Expenditure Requirements

Sponsor: Don Carlson

Status: Passed House Hi Ed, Passed Approps

Key Components:

Exempts higher ed institutions from budget and accounting requirement to spend state appropriated and non-state appropriated funds in a ratio that conserves state appropriated funds.

SB 6438 Include 4 Year Institutions in Running Start

Sponsor: Al Bauer

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Passed Ways & Means

Key Components:

Allows four-year institutions to participate in the running start program for high school students in the same manner that community colleges currently participate.

HB 2605 Higher Education "Emancipation"

Sponsor: Representative Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed (as amended), Passed Appropriations

Key Components:

NOTE: **Bold = ICLO supports**

Italic = ICLO opposes

Plain = ICLO split or undecided

**=provision amended out of bill

1. Gives institutional governing boards control over tuition rate-setting authority, with an upper limit based on a calculation of putting the institution in the 90th

HB 2327 Core Services for Disabled Students

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen (at the request of the Governor)

Status: Passed House Higher Education, Passed Approps. Action scheduled on floor.

Key Components:

Amplifies ADA requirements and lists 16 core services for disabled students that institutions should provide at the request of a student.

HB 1674 Changing Residency Status for Native Americans

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed; Passed Senate Hi Ed, **Passed Senate** (as amended).

Key Components:

Gives Washington residency status (for tuition purposes) to students of Native American ancestry whose traditional tribal domain is within the state of Washington. Amended on Senate floor to apply only to Native Americans living in Idaho, Oregon, and Montana.

SSB 6481 Student S & A Fees

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen/Al Bauer

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed 2-2-94 (as amended), Passed Ways & Means. Scheduled for floor vote.

Key Components:

Changes authority to make transfers of S & A funds after a budget has been approved.

SB 6362 Higher Education Efficiency

Sponsor: Al Bauer by request of OFM

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Passed Ways & Means.

Key Components:

Legislation has two provisions: raises bid limits for four year higher ed institutions from the current \$25,000 to \$50,000; and exempts institutions from provisions of budget and accounting act that require institutions spend funds in a manner which conserves state appropriated monies (allows for tuition carry-forward).

HB 2403 Higher Education added tuition/fees for long time students

Sponsor: Helen Sommers

Status: Failed in House Hi Ed 2-3-94.

Key Components:

Bill would require that students pay 20% more tuition when they have accumulated credits beyond 115% of those required for their particular degree program.

SB 5894 Student Progression Agreements

Sponsor: Kevin Quigley

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed 1-31-94 (as amended) Died in Ways & Means.

Key Components:

At the request of an entering student, an institution must enter a signed agreement with student to guarantee that access to courses required for receiving a degree will be available in order for the student to finish in a timely (i.e. 4 years for most degrees) manner. The student must agree to take a sufficient course load to enable them to complete their degree in the stipulated time.

SB 5893 Higher Ed Grants to Loans

Sponsors: Kevin Quigley and Harold Hochstatter

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Died in Ways & Means

Key Components:

Changes state financial aid provisions so that 70% of student financial aid will be provided in the form of loans rather than grants. The remaining 30% will be distributed primarily in the form of work study money.

HB 2773 Higher Ed Minimum Wage

Sponsors: Mike Heavey, Ken Jacobsen

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Allows institutions of higher ed to employ students at 85% of minimum wage when both institution and student meet certain requirements.

HB 2528 College Promise Enacted/ 601 Clarifying Language

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed, Died in Approps (college promise amended to 2605)

Key Components:

Creates a scheme for providing financial aid to college students of families with incomes of up to 125% of the median (median = \$41,000/family of four). Also provided clarifying language for tuition and other institutional fees to be outside the requirements of Initiative 601.

Council of Presidents' Office

Representing Washington's public, four-year higher education institutions
Terry Teale, Executive Director

FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

DATE: 2-22-94

TIME: 1:15

TO: President Niles

FROM: Mary Mary

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER PAGE: 10

(206) 753-5107

If there are any questions or problems regarding this transmission, please call SCAN 234-5107 or (206) 753-5107.

Helen Sommers' budget (House version). Major provisions:

- 1) No cut to his ed this year
- 2) \$3.4 mill his ed enhancement for distinguished professorships & graduate fellowships
- 3) of the above, Central receive:
 - a) \$250,000 (for which we must get matching \$) for a distinguished professorship; &
 - b) \$100,000 for 4 graduate fellowships
- 4) intent language to cut us 1.25% next biennium to pay for salary increase.

Also, our capital budget is fine - what we requested.

Operating Budget

MAINTAIN HIGHER EDUCATION

MAJOR POLICY INITIATIVES

- **Higher Education Access.**
The Governor's proposed \$22 million reduction to the institutions of higher education is fully restored. This restoration protects the enrollment growth funded in the original budget of 10,000 new students.
- **Distinguished Professorships/Graduate Fellowships - \$3.4 million GF-S**
Provides \$3.4 million to create endowments for 12 distinguished professors and 16 graduate fellows at the four-year institutions of higher education. This one-time expenditure of public funds will be matched with private funds to create ongoing trusts. Interest earnings from the endowment will fund future programs.

LONG-TERM STRATEGIES

- **1995-97 Efficiency Reduction (\$20 million GF-S savings)**
The institutions of higher education are directed to begin preparing for efficiency reductions in 1995-97. The budget assumes a 1.25 percent reduction at the four-year institutions and a 1.0 percent reduction at the community and technical colleges. These measures will save \$20 million during the 1995-97 biennium that will be directed toward higher education compensation increases.

OTHER PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

- **Community and Technical College Faculty Salary Increments - \$1.1 million GF-S**
Provides \$1.1 million to the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges for unfunded faculty salary increments. In addition, colleges are given authority to use savings from employee turnover to fund increments.
- **New Community College District - \$225,000 GF-S**
Funding is provided for planning of the new community college district created by SHB 2210. The new Cascadia Community College will be co-located with the UW Bothell Branch campus.

Central Washington University

(Dollars in Thousands)

Sunday, Feb. 20, 1994
10:28 pm

	House Proposed			Senate			Governor		
	FTEs	GF-S	Total	FTEs	GF-S	Total	FTEs	GF-S	Total
1993-95 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATIONS	902.8	66,482	113,843	902.8	66,482	113,843	902.8	66,482	113,843
Supplemental Items:									
1. Retrospective Rating Refund	0.0	0	10	0.0	0	10	0.0	0	10
2. Health Benefit Savings	0.0	-479	-479	0.0	-592	-592	0.0	-479	-479
3. Efficiency Initiatives	0.0	0	0	-1.4	-798	-798	-5.9	-831	-831
4. Transitional Funding	0.0	0	0	0.0	798	798	0.0	0	0
Total Supplemental Items	0.0	-479	-469	-1.4	-592	-582	-5.9	-1,310	-1,300
1993-95 REVISED APPROPRIATIONS	902.8	66,003	113,374	901.4	65,890	113,261	896.9	65,172	112,543

Comments:

- 1. Retrospective Rating Refund** - This proposal will enable the University to spend this refund for management of hazardous wastes.
- 2. Health Benefit Savings** - Reflects the savings in employee health benefit costs due to a rate reduction from \$356.46 to 305.32 per employee. There is no reduction in actual health benefits.
- 3. Efficiency Initiatives** - No reduction is made to the University's 1993-95 budget. However, the University is directed to start preparing to implement a 1.25 percent reduction in 1995-97. Savings in 1995-97 will go toward funding compensation increases. In order to implement the 1995-97 reduction without reducing enrollment levels, the University is encouraged to review instructional programs to identify duplicative and low-productivity programs for possible consolidation or termination.

FEB 22 1994 01:33PM COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS
Pending Overlap

Operating Budget

(2) \$186,000 of the general fund appropriation is provided solely to recruit and retain minorities.

(3) \$200,000 of the health services account appropriation is provided solely for health benefits for teaching and research assistants pursuant to Engrossed House Bill No. 2123.

Sec. 606. 1993 sp.s. c 24 s 606 (uncodified) is amended to read as follows:

FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

General Fund Appropriation	\$	((66,482,000))
		<u>66,003,000</u>
<u>Industrial Insurance Premium Refund Account</u>		
Appropriation	\$	<u>10,000</u>
Health Services Account Appropriation	\$	140,000
TOTAL APPROPRIATION	\$	((66,622,000))
		<u>66,153,000</u>

The appropriations in this section are subject to the following conditions and limitations:

(1) \$372,000 of the general fund appropriation is provided solely for assessment of student outcomes.

(2) \$140,000 of the general fund appropriation is provided solely to recruit and retain minorities.

(3) \$140,000 of the health services account appropriation is provided solely for health for benefits teaching and research assistants pursuant to Engrossed House Bill No. 2123.

Sec. 607. 1993 sp.s. c 24 s 607 (uncodified) is amended to read as follows:

FOR THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

General Fund Appropriation	\$	((37,207,000))
		<u>36,899,000</u>

The appropriation in this section is subject to the following conditions and limitations:

(1) \$372,000 of the general fund appropriation is provided solely for assessment of student outcomes.

(2) \$94,000 of the general fund appropriation is provided solely to recruit and retain minorities.

*Operating Budget**intent language*

(3) For the 1995-97 biennium, it is the intent of the legislature to make further efficiency reductions in higher education. Related savings will go toward funding compensation increases. Reductions will be one and one quarter percent of 1993-95 budgets for four-year institutions and one percent for the community and technical college system. Institutions will be given maximum flexibility in implementing these reductions. However, each institution shall address the needs of its students by not reducing enrollments below budgeted levels. In order to accomplish this, institutions are encouraged to begin a review of instructional programs to identify duplicative and low-productivity programs for possible consolidation or termination.

(4) The appropriations in sections 602 through 608 of this act provide state general fund support for student full time equivalent enrollments at each institution of higher education. The state general fund budget is further premised on a level of specific student tuition revenue collected into and expended from the institutions of higher education--general local accounts. Listed below are the annual full time equivalent student enrollments by institution assumed in this act.

	1993-94	1994-95
	Annual	Annual
	Average	Average
	FTE	FTE
University of Washington		
Main campus	29,762	29,826
Evening Degree Program . . .	465	525
Tacoma branch	450	490
Bothell branch	427	449
Washington State University		
Main campus	15,965	15,991
Spokane branch	248	258
Tri-Cities branch	519	541
Vancouver branch	511	595
Central Washington University	6,666	6,810
Eastern Washington University	7,429	7,573
The Evergreen State College .	3,226	3,258

1 Laws of 1991 (timber dependent communities). The number of students
2 served shall be 50 full time equivalent students per fiscal year.

3 (2) \$3,000,000 of the general fund--state appropriation is provided
4 for transfer to the Washington distinguished professorship trust fund.

5 (a) For the biennium ending June 30, 1995, all appropriations to
6 the Washington distinguished professorship trust fund shall be
7 allocated as provided in this subsection. The state treasurer shall
8 reserve the following amounts in the trust fund for distribution to
9 four-year higher education institutions at such time as qualifying
10 gifts for distinguished professorships have been deposited pursuant to
11 RCW 28B.10.866 through 28B.10.874:

12 (i) \$1,000,000 of the appropriation for the University of
13 Washington:

14 (ii) \$1,000,000 of the appropriation for Washington State
15 University:

16 (iii) \$250,000 of the appropriation for Eastern Washington
17 University:

18 (iv) \$250,000 of the appropriation for Central Washington ★
19 University:

20 (v) \$250,000 of the appropriation for Western Washington
21 University:

22 (vi) \$250,000 of the appropriation for The Evergreen State College.

23 (b) As of June 30, 1995, if any funds reserved in (a) of this
24 subsection have not been designated as matching funds for qualifying
25 gifts, any four-year institution of higher education that has otherwise
26 fully utilized the professorships allocated to it by this subsection
27 may be eligible for such funds under rules established by the higher
28 education coordinating board.

29 (3) \$400,000 of the general fund--state appropriation is provided
30 solely for transfer to the Washington graduate fellowship trust fund.

31 (a) For the biennium ending June 30, 1995, all appropriations to
32 the Washington graduate fellowship trust fund shall be allocated as
33 provided in this subsection. The state treasurer shall reserve the
34 following amounts in the trust fund for distribution to four-year
35 higher education institutions at such time as qualifying gifts for
36 graduate fellows have been deposited:

37 (i) \$100,000 of the appropriation for Eastern Washington
38 University:

Operating Budget

- * 1 (ii) \$100,000 of the appropriation for Central Washington
 2 University:
 3 (iii) \$100,000 of the appropriation for Western Washington
 4 University:
 5 (iv) \$100,000 of the appropriation for The Evergreen State College
 6 (b) As of June 30, 1995, if any funds reserved in (a) of this
 7 subsection have not been designated as matching funds for qualifying
 8 gifts, any four-year institution of higher education that has otherwise
 9 fully utilized the fellowships allocated to it by this subsection may
 10 be eligible for such funds under rules established by the higher
 11 education coordinating board.

12 Sec. 610. 1993 sp.s. c 24 s 610 (uncodified) is amended to read :
 13 follows:

14 **FOR THE HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD--FINANCIAL AID AND GRANT**
 15 **PROGRAMS**

16 General Fund--State Appropriation	\$	((126,315,000)
17		126,245,000
18 General Fund--Federal Appropriation	\$	6,381,000
19 Health Services Account Appropriation	\$	2,230,000
20 State Education Grant Account Appropriation	\$	40,000
21 TOTAL APPROPRIATION	\$	((134,966,000)
22		134,896,000

23 The appropriations in this section are subject to the following
 24 conditions and limitations:

25 (1) \$1,044,000 of the general fund--state appropriation is provided
 26 solely for the displaced homemakers program.

27 (2) \$2,000,000 of the health services account appropriation is
 28 provided solely for scholarships and loans under chapter 28B.115 RCW
 29 health professional conditional scholarship program. If Engrossed
 30 Second Substitute Senate Bill No. 5304 (health care reform) is not
 31 enacted by June 30, 1993, this appropriation shall lapse.

32 (3) \$230,000 of the health services account appropriation is
 33 provided solely for the health personnel resources plan. If Engrossed
 34 Second Substitute Senate Bill No. 5304 is not enacted by June 30, 1993
 35 this appropriation shall lapse.

36 (4) \$431,000 of the general fund--state appropriation is provided
 37 solely for the western interstate commission for higher education.

1994 SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL BUDGET NEW PROJECTS & REPRIORITIZATIONS

	GOVERNOR		SENATE		HOUSE Capital Budget Committee		HOUSE / SENATE DIFFERENCE	
	State Bonds	Other Funds	State Bonds	Other Funds	State Bonds	Other Funds	State Bonds	Other Funds
EDUCATION								
State Board of Education Common School Construction: Fund Switch	15,250,000	(15,250,000)				(52,300,000)		(52,300,000)
							Funded in Operating Budget	
Washington State Historical Society Boiler Replacement	25,800		14,000		14,000			
Eastern Washington State Historical Society Cheney Cowles Museum: Emergency Repairs	20,800		20,800		20,800			
TOTAL EDUCATION	15,296,600	(15,250,000)	34,800	0	34,800	(52,300,000)		(52,300,000)
HIGHER EDUCATION								
University of Washington Branch Campus - Bothell (transferred to OFM)	(23,000,000)		(23,000,000)		(20,710,000)		2,290,000	
Parrington Hall Renovation				3,550,000		3,513,499		(36,501)
Denny Hall Renovation				(1,550,000)		(1,547,132)		2,868
Total	(23,000,000)	0	(23,000,000)	2,000,000	(20,710,000)	1,966,367	2,290,000	(33,633)
Washington State University Veterinary Teaching Hospital Equipment	8,950,500		5,155,000		7,110,500		1,955,500	
Central Washington University Animal Research Facility Law Suit		200,000		200,000		200,000		
Hertz Hall Emergency Repairs	125,000		125,000		125,000			
Barge Hall Remodel	(125,000)		(125,000)		(125,000)			
Total	0	200,000	0	200,000	0	200,000	0	0
TOTAL HIGHER EDUCATION	(14,049,500)	200,000	(17,845,000)	2,200,000	(13,599,500)	2,166,367	4,245,500	(33,633)
STATEWIDE TOTAL	10,086,795	(17,290,000)	(23,117,505)	2,905,805	(6,825,465)	(46,794,942)	16,292,100	(49,700,747)
STATE WIDE TOTAL ALL FUNDS		(7,203,205)		(20,211,700)		(53,620,347)		(33,408,647)

Capital Budget

1	Reappropriation:		
2	St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	1,400,000
3	EWU Cap Proj Acct	\$	97,000
4			-----
5	Subtotal Reappropriation	\$	1,497,000
6	Appropriation:		
7	EWU Cap Proj Acct	\$	1,000,000
8	Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	1,087,392
9	Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
10			-----
11	TOTAL	\$	3,584,392

12 Sec. 79. 1993 sp.s. c 22 s 808 (uncodified) is amended to read as
13 follows:

14 **FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

15 **Psychology animal research facility (90-1-060)**

16	Reappropriation:		
17	St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	80,000
18	Appropriation:		
19	CWU Cap Proj Acct	\$	200,000
20	Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	((1,620,000))
21			<u>1,935,848</u>
22	Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
23			-----
24	TOTAL	\$	((1,700,000))
25			<u>2,215,848</u>

26 Sec. 80. 1993 sp.s. c 22 s 813 (uncodified) is amended to read as
27 follows:

28 **FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

29 **Barge Hall remodel (92-2-001)**

30 The appropriation in this section shall not be expended until the
31 capital project review requirements of section 1015 of this act have
32 been met.

33	Reappropriation:		
34	St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	((2,550,000))
35			<u>2,425,000</u>
36	Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	((9,031,970))
37			<u>9,598,398</u>
38	Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
39			-----
40	TOTAL	\$	((11,581,970))
41			<u>12,023,398</u>

42 **NEW SECTION.** Sec. 81. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22
43 to read as follows:

44 **FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

Infrastructure project savings (94-1-999)

Projects which are completed in accordance with section 1014, chapter 22, Laws of 1993 sp.s. that have been reviewed by the office of financial management may have their remaining funds transferred to this project for the following purposes: (1) Road and sidewalk repair; (2) roof repair; (3) electrical system repair; (4) steam and utility distribution system repair; (5) plumbing system repair; (6) heating, ventilation, and air conditioning repairs; and (7) emergency repairs due to natural disasters or accidents.

A report of any transfer effected under this section shall be filed with the legislative fiscal committees of the senate and house of representatives by the director of financial management.

Appropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	1
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	0
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0

TOTAL	\$	1

NEW SECTION. Sec. 82. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22 to read as follows:

FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Hertz Hall Structural Repairs (94-1-012)

Appropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	125,000
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	0
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	

TOTAL	\$	125,000.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 83. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22 to read as follows:

FOR WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Infrastructure project savings (94-1-999)

Projects which are completed in accordance with section 1014, chapter 22, Laws of 1993 sp.s. that have been reviewed by the office of financial management may have their remaining funds transferred to this project for the following purposes: (1) Road and sidewalk repair; (2) roof repair; (3) electrical system repair; (4) steam and utility distribution system repair; (5) plumbing system repair; (6) heating, ventilation, and air conditioning repairs; and (7) emergency repairs due to natural disasters or accidents.

A report of any transfer effected under this section shall be filed with the legislative fiscal committees of the senate and house of representatives by the director of financial management.

Appropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	1
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	

Central Washington University

(Dollars in Thousands)

Wednesday, Feb. 16, 1994
8:28 am

	Lowry Recommended 94 Supp			Senate			Difference		
	FTEs	GF-S	Total	FTEs	GF-S	Total	FTEs	GF-S	Total
1993-95 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATIONS	902.8	66,482	113,843	902.8	66,482	113,843	0.0	0	0
Supplemental Items:									
1. Retrospective Rating Refund	0.0	0	10	0.0	0	10	0.0	0	0
2. Health Benefit Savings	0.0	-479	-479	0.0	-592	-592	0.0	113	113
3. Efficiency Initiatives	-5.9	-831	-831	-1.4	-798	-798	-4.5	-33	-33
4. Transitional Funding	0.0	0	0	0.0	798	798	0.0	-798	-798
Total Supplemental Items	-5.9	-1,310	-1,300	-1.4	-592	-582	-4.5	-718	-718
1993-95 REVISED APPROPRIATIONS	896.9	65,172	112,543	901.4	65,890	113,261	-4.5	-718	-718

Comments:

1. Retrospective Rating Refund - This proposal will enable the University to spend this refund for management of hazardous wastes.

2. Health Benefit Savings - The funding for health benefits for state employees is reduced because estimated medical inflation has changed from 13.5 percent to 8.5 percent. The Governor's budget further reduces health benefits funding by using a \$40 million surplus in the State Employees' Insurance Account to lower the premium rates, and by assuming that managed competition will be implemented beginning January 1, 1995. The Senate budget reduces health benefits funding by using the entire \$58 million surplus to lower premiums. The Senate budget does not assume that managed competition will be implemented this biennium.

3. Efficiency Initiatives - Savings are anticipated to be achieved through further consolidation of programs, elimination of duplication, increased productivity, and reductions which are compatible with strategic planning goals. It is intended that current enrollments levels will be maintained to the extent possible. This amount represents a reduction of 1.2% of the 1993-95 GF-S appropriation. This reduction will be also biennialized for the 1995-97 budget.

4. Transitional Funding - One-time funding is provided in recognition of the institutional constraints which impede the rapid implementation of the efficiency reduction. Funds remaining in excess of the implementation costs may be applied to one-time purchases for instructional materials and supplies.

1994 SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL BUDGET NEW PROJECTS & REPRIORITIZATIONS

	GOVERNOR		SENATE		DIFFERENCE	
	State Bonds	Other Funds	State Bonds	Other Funds	State Bonds	Other Funds
NATURAL RESOURCES						
Energy Office						
Energy Partnerships Reappropriation		(2,000,000)		(2,000,000)	0	0
Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation						
Mt. Spokane Trail Development, Federal		100,000		125,000	0	25,000
State Parks						
Iron Horse Trail				70,000	0	70,000
Ocean Beach Access			(213,000)	(249,195)	(213,000)	(249,195)
Westport Facility Repair				(70,000)	0	(70,000)
Total	0	0	(213,000)	(249,195)	(213,000)	(249,195)
Department of Fisheries						
Fish Rearing Pond Sites		300,000		300,000	0	0
Department of Wildlife						
Grandv Creek Hatchery	(4,000,000)				4,000,000	0
Department of Natural Resources			(15,000,000)		(15,000,000)	0
Trustland Transfer Program					0	0
TOTAL NATURAL RESOURCES	(4,000,000)	(1,600,000)	(15,000,000)	(1,575,000)	(11,000,000)	0
EDUCATION						
State Board of Education						
Common School Construction	15,250,000	(15,250,000)			(15,250,000)	15,250,000
Washington State Historical Society						
Boiler Replacement	25,800		14,000		(11,800)	0
Eastern Washington State Historical Society						
Cheney Cowles Museum, Emergency Repairs	20,800		20,800		0	0
TOTAL EDUCATION	15,296,600	(15,250,000)	34,800	0	(15,261,800)	15,250,000
HIGHER EDUCATION						
University of Washington						
Branch Campus - Bothell (transferred to OFM)	(23,000,000)		(23,000,000)		0	0
Washington State University						
Veterinary Teaching Hospital Equipment	8,950,500		5,155,000		(3,795,500)	0
Central Washington University						
Animal Research Facility Law Suit		200,000		200,000	0	0
Hertz Hall Emergency Repairs	125,000		125,000		0	0
Barge Hall Remodel	(125,000)		(125,000)		0	0
Total	0	200,000	0	200,000	0	0
TOTAL HIGHER EDUCATION	(14,049,500)	200,000	(17,845,000)	200,000	(3,795,500)	0
STATEWIDE TOTAL	10,086,795	(16,529,000)	(22,904,505)	1,916,000	(32,991,300)	18,445,000

A report of any transfer effected under this section shall be filed with the legislative fiscal committee of the senate and house of representatives by the director of financial management.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 63. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22 to read as follows:

FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Hertz Hall Structural Repairs (94-1-012)

Appropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	125,000
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	0
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
TOTAL	\$	125,000

NEW SECTION. Sec. 64. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22 to read as follows:

FOR WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Infrastructure project savings (94-1-999)

Projects which are completed in accordance with section 1014, chapter 22, Laws of 1993 sp.s. that have been reviewed by the office of financial management may have their remaining funds transferred to this project for the following purposes: (1) Road and sidewalk repair; (2) roof repair; (3) electrical system repair; (4) steam and utility distribution system repair; (5) plumbing system repair; (6) heating, ventilation, and air conditioning repairs; and (7) emergency repairs due to natural disasters or accidents.

A report of any transfer effected under this section shall be filed with the legislative fiscal committee of the senate and house of representatives by the director of financial management.

Appropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	1
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	0
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
TOTAL	\$	1

NEW SECTION. Sec. 65. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22 to read as follows:

FOR THE WASHINGTON STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Capital Museum boiler replacement (94-1-003)

Appropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	14,000
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	0
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
TOTAL	\$	14,000

1 Psychology animal research facility (90-1-060)

2 Reappropriation:

3 St Bldg Constr Acct \$ 80,000

4 Appropriation:

5 CWU Cap Proj Acct \$ 200,000

6 Prior Biennia (Expenditures) \$((1,620,000))

7 1,935,848

8 Future Biennia (Projected Costs) . . \$ 0

9 -----

10 TOTAL \$((1,700,000))

11 2,215,848

12 Sec. 61. 1993 sp.s. c 22 s 813 (uncodified) is amended to read as

13 follows:

14 FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

15 Barge Hall remodel (92-2-001)

16 The appropriation in this section shall not be expended until the

17 capital project review requirements of section 1015 of this act have

18 been met.

19 Reappropriation:

20 St Bldg Constr Acct \$ ((2,550,000))

21 2,425,000

22 Prior Biennia (Expenditures) . . \$ ((9,031,970))

23 9,598,398

24 Future Biennia (Projected Costs) \$ 0

25 -----

26 TOTAL \$ ((11,501,970))

27 12,023,398

28 NEW SECTION. Sec. 62. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22

29 to read as follows:

30 FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

31 Infrastructure project savings (94-1-999)

32 Projects which are completed in accordance with section 1014,

33 chapter 22, Laws of 1993 sp.s. that have been reviewed by the office of

34 financial management may have their remaining funds transferred to this

35 project for the following purposes: (1) Road and sidewalk repair; (2)

36 roof repair; (3) electrical system repair; (4) steam and utility

37 distribution system repair; (5) plumbing system repair; (6) heating,

38 ventilation, and air conditioning repairs; and (7) emergency repairs

39 due to natural disasters or accidents.

40 Appropriation:

41 St Bldg Constr Acct \$ 1

42 Prior Biennia (Expenditures) . . . \$ 0

43 Future Biennia (Projected Costs) . . \$ 0

44 -----

45 TOTAL \$ 1

Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	2,430,703
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
TOTAL		\$ ((27,442,894))
		<u>32,565,584</u>

NEW SECTION. Sec. 58. A new section is added to 1993 sp.s. c 22 to read as follows:

FOR EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Infrastructure project savings (94-1-999)

Projects which are completed in accordance with section 1014, chapter 22, Laws of 1993 sp.s. that have been reviewed by the office of financial management may have their remaining funds transferred to this project for the following purposes: (1) Road and sidewalk repair; (2) roof repair; (3) electrical system repair; (4) steam and utility distribution system repair; (5) plumbing system repair; (6) heating, ventilation, and air conditioning repairs; and (7) emergency repairs due to natural disasters or accidents.

A report of any transfer effected under this section shall be filed with the legislative fiscal committee of the senate and house of representatives by the director of financial management.

Appropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	1
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	0
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
TOTAL		\$ 1

Sec. 59. 1993 sp.s. c 22 s 791 (uncodified) is amended to read as follows:

FOR EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Telecommunications: Cable replacement (90-2-004)

Reappropriation:

St Bldg Constr Acct	\$	1,400,000
EWU Cap Proj Acct	\$	97,000

Subtotal Reappropriation	\$	1,497,000
--------------------------	----	-----------

Appropriation:

EWU Cap Proj Acct	\$	1,000,000
Prior Biennia (Expenditures)	\$	1,087,392
Future Biennia (Projected Costs)	\$	0
TOTAL		\$ 3,584,392

Sec. 60. 1993 sp.s. c 22 s 808 (uncodified) is amended to read as follows:

FOR CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Major Legislative Issues and Status
February 11, 1994
Day 33 of 60 Day Session

ISSUES AND INFORMATION:

SB 6519 School Employee Salary Increases

Sponsor: Dan McDonald, John Moyer

Status: Holding in Senate Ways & Means

Key Components:

Provides for a salary increase for K-12 school personnel, and incremental increases for community college personnel, by cutting the equipment and travel budget of the remainder of state government 12.5% across-the-board. Disproportionately cuts higher education (over half of the cuts would come from higher ed).

HB 2147 Exempting Institutions of Hi Ed from Certain Expenditure

Requirements

Sponsor: Don Carlson

Status: Passed House Hi Ed, Passed Approps

Key Components:

Exempts higher ed institutions from budget and accounting requirement to spend state appropriated and non-state appropriated funds in a ratio that conserves state appropriated funds.

SB 6438 Include 4 Year Institutions in Running Start

Sponsor: Al Bauer

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Passed Ways & Means

Key Components:

Allows four-year institutions to participate in the running start program for high school students in the same manner that community colleges currently participate.

HB 2605 Higher Education "Emancipation"

Sponsor: Representative Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed (as amended), Passed Appropriations

Key Components:

NOTE: **Bold** = ICLO supports

Italic = ICLO opposes

Plain = ICLO split or undecided

**=provision amended out of bill

1. Gives institutional governing boards control over tuition rate-setting authority, with an upper limit based on a calculation of putting the institution in the 90th

percentile (using HECB peers as a guide) in quality funding in the nation by the year 2002. Amended in House Approps to limit tuition increases to no more than 10% at any one time.

NOTE: Attorney General's opinion is that tuition is not covered by 601 restrictions if it remains with the legislature, and is covered by 601 if tuition is set at the discretion of institutional governing boards.

****2. Eliminates bid limits for contracting jobs within institutions.**

3. Allows institutions to carry-forward tuition money at the end of a biennium, rather than returning savings to the state.

4. No salary restrictions set by the state. Institutions may offer merit pay with money saved on projects or money retained at the end of a biennium.

5. Simplifies allotment requirements between institutions and OFM.

6. Raises amount of tuition required to be deposited in a local financial aid fund from the current 2.5% to 5%.

***7. Gives HECB authority to distribute all new enrollments funded by the state. Enrollments can be given to either public or private institutions, based on the HECB's assessment of cost effectiveness and quality.*

***8. Removes HECB authority for new program review.*

***9. Removes HECB authority to moderate off-campus disputes between institutions.*

10. Allows institutions to contract out for services.

11. Building fees, local capital funds and program fees are at the discretion of the institution -- no limit on amount or percentage of tuition that would go to such local accounts.

12. Approps amendment creates a scheme for providing financial aid to college students of families with incomes of up to 125% of the median (median = \$41,000/family of four).

SHB 1005 Students on Governing Boards

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House 80 - 14. No action scheduled in Senate.

Key Components:

Requires regional universities and TESC to have one student on their Boards of Trustees. Requires research universities to have two students on their Boards of Regents (1 undergrad, 1 grad).

HB 2327 Core Services for Disabled Students

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen (at the request of the Governor)

Status: Passed House Higher Education, Passed Approps. Action scheduled on floor.

Key Components:

Amplifies ADA requirements and lists 16 core services for disabled students that institutions should provide at the request of a student.

HB 1674 Changing Residency Status for Native Americans

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed; Passed Senate Hi Ed, **Passed Senate** (as amended).

Key Components:

Gives Washington residency status (for tuition purposes) to students of Native American ancestry whose traditional tribal domain is within the state of Washington. Amended on Senate floor to apply only to Native Americans living in Idaho, Oregon, and Montana.

SSB 6481 Student S & A Fees

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen/Al Bauer

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed 2-2-94 (as amended), Passed Ways & Means. Scheduled for floor vote.

Key Components:

Changes authority to make transfers of S & A funds after a budget has been approved.

SB 6362 Higher Education Efficiency

Sponsor: Al Bauer by request of OFM

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Passed Ways & Means.

Key Components:

Legislation has two provisions: raises bid limits for four year higher ed institutions from the current \$25,000 to \$50,000; and exempts institutions from provisions of budget and accounting act that require institutions spend funds in a manner which conserves state appropriated monies (allows for tuition carry-forward).

Major Legislation now Dead

HB 2322 College/University Legal Counsel

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: DEAD

Bill allows institutions of higher education to contract for legal counsel from the private sector, rather than using counsel assigned from the state Attorney General's office.

SHB 1468/ SB 6361 Faculty Collective Bargaining

Sponsor: Mike Heavey

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Enabling legislation to allow faculty at institutions to bargain collectively.

Note: UW and WSU are going to be written out of the bill (at their request). Their faculties support collective bargaining in principle, but believe this bill is a bad vehicle because: 1) agreements reached under collective bargaining could override faculty code; 2) tenure track faculty are in one bargaining unit and other faculty in another; 3) it is not clear what would be subject to bargaining.

HB 2473 Public Agency Lobbyists

Sponsor: Holly Meyer

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

States that any public institution or agency may have only one lobbyist (according to PDC regulations) on the state payroll.

HB 2454 Sporting Events Violence

Sponsor: Steve Van Luven (note: Gary Chandler is a co-sponsor)

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Makes it a misdemeanor for an athlete or a coach to engage in a "violent act that does not reasonably further the goal or purpose of the sport the person is participating in...."

HB ZZZZ Institutional Task Forces on Issues of Concern to Students

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Directs institutions to create a task force to discuss legislative issues of concern with students, including but not limited to issues such as students on governing boards, negative check off for voluntary students fees, and the distribution of S & A fees.

HB 2403 Higher Education added tuition/fees for long time students

Sponsor: Helen Sommers

Status: Failed in House Hi Ed 2-3-94.

Key Components:

Bill would require that students pay 20% more tuition when they have accumulated credits beyond 115% of those required for their particular degree program.

SB 5894 Student Progression Agreements

Sponsor: Kevin Quigley

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed 1-31-94 (as amended) Died in Ways & Means.

Key Components:

At the request of an entering student, an institution must enter a signed agreement with student to guarantee that access to courses required for receiving a degree will be available in order for the student to finish in a timely (i.e. 4 years for most degrees) manner. The student must agree to take a sufficient course load to enable them to complete their degree in the stipulated time.

SB 5893 Higher Ed Grants to Loans

Sponsors: Kevin Quigley and Harold Hochstatter

Status: Passed Senate Hi Ed, Died in Ways & Means

Key Components:

Changes state financial aid provisions so that 70% of student financial aid will be provided in the form of loans rather than grants. The remaining 30% will be distributed primarily in the form of work study money.

HB 2773 Higher Ed Minimum Wage

Sponsors: Mike Heavey, Ken Jacobsen

Status: DEAD

Key Components:

Allows institutions of higher ed to employ students at 85% of minimum wage when both institution and student meet certain requirements.

HB 2528 College Promise Enacted/ 601 Clarifying Language

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Hi Ed, Died in Approps (college promise amended to 2605)

Key Components:

Creates a scheme for providing financial aid to college students of families with incomes of up to 125% of the median (median = \$41,000/family of four). Also provided clarifying language for tuition and other institutional fees to be outside the requirements of Initiative 601.

HB 1364 Check Off for Student Organizations Support

Sponsor: Ken Jacobsen

Status: Passed House Higher Education (as amended), Died in Approps

Key Components:

Allows student organizations to collect voluntary students fees for their support using institutional registration system. Students may use either positive or negative check-off.